



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE **108<sup>th</sup>** CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 150

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 4, 2004

No. 60

## House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BURNS).

### DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

May 4, 2004.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MAX BURNS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

### MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) for 5 minutes.

### PRESCRIPTION DRUG DISCOUNT CARDS

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, this week seniors nationwide will begin to see how ineffective and confusing the Republican prescription drug legislation is. This week, seniors have the opportunity to sign up for a new prescription drug card that will provide supposed savings on prescription drug costs.

The program begins on June 1; and while the new Medicare law will not take effect until 2006, it is clear that these drug cards are being used as a

ploy to enroll beneficiaries into products sponsored by the private drug and insurance industry.

Mr. Speaker, while some seniors will be able to save on their medications when they use these cards, many will not. In fact, I believe these drugs cards are nothing more than window dressing, a weak attempt by the Bush administration to couch the true intent of this Medicare law.

As seniors will see in the upcoming weeks, there is no guaranteed discount from drug card sponsors. Medicare discount cards are being marketed as providing a 10 to 25 percent discount, but there is no requirement in the new law that card sponsors must offer any specific discount. The idea of any savings is merely an illusion. Prescription costs rose 17 percent alone last year and drug prices are reported to have increased dramatically between the beginning of the year and now, so any savings have been lost to drug cost inflation.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out secondly, there is no guarantee that a particular drug card will offer discounts on all of the medicines taken by seniors. Card sponsors are allowed to pick and choose which drugs will be discounted. In addition, card sponsors may change the discounted prices on medicines weekly.

The discounts on a seniors' medicine when advertised when he or she enrolled may change, but that senior will not be allowed to switch to a different card for one whole year. So imagine that, Mr. Speaker, a card sponsor can change prices any time they want, but seniors have to stick with the same drug card for an entire year.

There is also no guarantee access to any particular pharmacy. Each discount card sponsor will determine which pharmacies will offer the discount advertised with the card. A seniors' usual pharmacy may not participate in the card that he or she selects.

Finally, the final price paid for prescriptions will vary by pharmacy. Because pharmacies can change the prices they charge, seniors must check with each of their local participating pharmacies to find out which one offers the lowest price on the drugs covered under their card.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask, how are seniors supposed to decipher all of this information that I mentioned. You would hope they would be able to get it from the Department of Health and Human Services; but that agency is too busy these days producing commercials trying to sell the new prescription drug law, rather than providing reliable information that seniors can use. Consider that drug cards sponsors are now saying that information on the Health and Human Services Web site designed to help seniors shop for the right card contains false information.

Mr. Speaker, if Health and Human Services cannot get the information right, how can we expect seniors to decide which plans works best for them?

Mr. Speaker, seniors should carefully consider their options. Unfortunately, they must remember that the Bush administration and Congressional Republicans were more concerned about how this legislation would affect the pharmaceutical companies than they were about how it would affect America's seniors. Seniors should remember that Democrats continue our fight to lower prescription drug costs by giving the government the purchasing power of millions of seniors to negotiate drug costs and to allow safe reimportation of drugs from Canada and elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, I have said many times that this Medicare prescription drug law should simply be repealed and we should go back to the drawing board. This idea of having these discount cards is too confusing and it will not result in lower drug prices for seniors. Imagine that they have to wait another 2 years after that before the

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H2493

Medicare law with the prescription drug benefit supposedly even comes into effect.

We should repeal the law, go back to the drawing board and come up with a prescription drug benefit that really helps senior citizens under Medicare, not this false and illusory drug card, the process which begins this week.

#### UNDOING HIDDEN TAXES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) is recognized during morning hour debates.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, the only thing confusing seniors are Democrats trying to confuse seniors about their ability to prescription drugs through a discount card. I think it is unfortunate that the Democrats have chosen confusion and misleading the seniors and getting lower prescription drugs as available to them through the new strengthening and improvement of the Medicare system.

Our Members have been home talking to seniors. To answer the question how will seniors be able to choose, our Members are home helping seniors go through the system and choosing the kind of discount card and the kind of program that best benefits them, rather than trying to confuse them.

But, Mr. Speaker, I came here to talk about something a little bit different.

Mr. Speaker, every year for 1,000 different reasons, and all of them our fault, American families are squeezed by the invisible grip of hidden taxes. These are laws and regulations, all of which are well intentioned, that cost our economy billions of dollars, billions of man hours and millions of new jobs.

In addition to income taxes, customers and consumers are stuck with regulatory compliance costs, litigation costs, interest payments on the national debt, and governmental waste, fraud and abuse. And all of these are eventually passed on to unsuspecting consumers in the form of higher prices.

This week the House will take up two bills specifically targeting some of those hidden taxes. The first of these will be the Middle Class Alternative Minimum Tax Relief Act from the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SIMMONS).

This legislation will protect 11 million working families and individuals from the unintended consequences of the Democrat-designed AMT, a tax provision preventing the wealthy from dodging their tax liability through creative accounting. Unfortunately, many middle income families have so benefited from Republican tax relief in 2001 and 2003, that the AMT now considers them rich.

Now, while deep down many Democrats may indeed consider a family earning \$45,000 per year to be rich, the majority of the people in this country, and thankfully in this body, have a

more realistic view of 21st century economics.

The Simmons bill is the first step towards making sure that the AMT only applies to those people it was designed to cover, not working families just trying to enjoy the fruits of their labor.

Also this week, Mr. Speaker, in the House we plan to take up the conference report on one of the strongest, most disciplined budgets Congress has passed in two decades. It meets our present and reemerging needs while holding a firm line on discretionary spending. By setting a course of fiscal responsibility even in a time of war, we are giving the American people an opportunity to grow our economy back into balance, thereby protecting them from any more hidden taxes in the future.

Mr. Speaker, for generations Americans have been saddled with taxes that are too high and a government that is not responsive enough. This week we will take two small steps toward solving both of those problems.

#### LEAVE NO CHILD BEHIND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, we teach our children that promises matter. And they do. So what kind of message does it send to our children when the President promises to leave no child behind but then breaks that promise by failing to provide our children the resources they need to get a world class education.

The fact is the President's budget cuts education funding by \$9.4 billion. That is \$9.4 billion less than the President himself said we needed to leave no child behind. So the only standard we are holding the President to is the standards he himself agreed to in his own education bill.

If that is not a broken promise, I do not know what is. Of course, \$9.4 billion is just a dollar figure. But to the children who do not and will not get the resources they need, it is much more than that; 2.4 million children will not get the help with math and reading they need; 1.3 million children will not have access to after-school activities, but will instead be sitting at home or out in the street without supervision.

Other children will be denied enrollment in Head Start because the President froze its funding. And tens of thousands of students will lose the grant work studies or loans they need to pay for college. These are the human costs of President Bush's broken promises on education.

He promised to leave no child behind, but then turns around and leaves millions of children behind. What kind of priorities are these?

We Democrats want to do what we all agreed, Democrats and Republicans

alike, is the right thing for our children: Investing the resources to raise student achievements in core subjects like reading and math; demanding results and accountability from our schools; making sure our students have up-to-date textbooks and technology; providing after-school programs for every child that needs them; ensuring access to Head Start; increasing financial aid to college students and simplifying the application process and forms; increasing the maximum Pell grant; doubling the HOPE Scholarship and making the HOPE tax credit refundable; expanding assistance to minority-serving institutions.

I know these things are really important because I began my career in public service as a high school student. I did not care for the education I received in my public school. I might have been young, but I knew that was not right. So I fought to change that. I won a seat on the school board and won the funding so that every student who would attend that school would have a quality education.

What we do here makes a difference in the lives of students. I know. The promises we make here matter in the lives of children. I know. And the level of our commitment to education will, in many ways, determine our success as a Nation in the years ahead.

I believe in opportunity, in personal responsibility. But without providing a quality education to our students, we will not have those things. And if America is going to compete in the global marketplace of the jobs and commerce and technology of the future, we need a workforce that receives the best education available, not one taught on a shoestring budget.

Today there are students learning in trailers, in outdated buildings, literally falling apart, with leaky roofs and without adequate heat, using outdated textbooks and crowded schools where teachers have to pay for supplies out of their own salaries. We can do much better than that.

America cannot and should not settle for second or third best when it comes to educating our children. To do so, we need to make the investment now. Unfortunately, President Bush and the Republicans made promises but we are failing to keep them. We Democrats want to make sure all the children in our Nation get the world class education they deserve. If you give us that chance, we will deliver that promise.

#### VALUABLE MILITARY CHAPLAINS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, there are rumors that were coming out of the Pentagon, rumors that I believe are extremely troubling. Outsourcing our military chaplains is a very bad idea.

This is not a new organization, Mr. Speaker. The Navy Chaplain Corps traces its inception to the Second Article of Navy Regulations adopted on November 28 of 1775 by the Continental Congress. This event occurred prior to the signing of the Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776, or the Constitution of September 17, 1787.

From the outset of the Continental Navy, due consideration was given to divine services and the placement of chaplains aboard ships. This Act provided a place for religion and chaplains in the Navy.

Additionally, the United States Army Chaplaincy was officially created by an act of the Continental Congress in July of 1775 upon the urgent request of General George Washington.

Mr. Speaker, the reason I wanted to come to the floor is because these rumors at the Pentagon I hope are nothing more than rumors because I cannot think of anything more important to a man or woman in uniform, whether they be young or old, than to have a chaplain that they feel very close to. And our chaplains wear the uniform. Our chaplains wear the helmet when they are in combat situations.

I would share with you, Mr. Speaker, just two paragraphs of a letter I wrote to Secretary Rumsfeld on April 28, 2004.

"Dear Mr. Secretary, I write to you today to urge you in the strongest of terms to reconsideration your decision to consider outsourcing our military chaplains.

□ 1245

"The service that they provide, not just to soldiers, airmen, sailors and Marines, but also their families here at home and overseas, are irreplaceable."

I also would like to share with you the last paragraph that I wrote to the Secretary: "One of their most valuable qualities is that they are trained by the individual service that they represent. These men and women are more than just priests, reverends, or rabbis. They are also soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines. How can you possibly justify selecting a civilian with absolutely no military experience to advise our troops in the field? Replacing the uniformed chaplain would be a crucial mistake. I hope you will consider these facts before you reach your final decision."

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to tell my colleagues that those of us on the Committee on Armed Services, both Republican and Democrat, we are very concerned about this. We have talked to the leadership of the Committee on Armed Services, our subcommittee chairmen, as well as our ranking member, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON); and also the chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), and I believe that we will come together as Republicans and Democrats in the Committee on Armed Services, as well as here on the House floor, to discourage and to deny the decisions, should one be forthcoming

from the Department of Defense, to outsource our chaplains. It is just absolutely unacceptable.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I will insert the entirety of this letter to Secretary Rumsfeld for the RECORD at this point.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, April 28, 2004.

Hon. DONALD RUMSFELD,  
Secretary of Defense, the Pentagon,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I write to you today to urge you in the strongest terms to reconsider your decision to consider outsourcing our military chaplains. The service they provide not just the Soldiers, Airmen, Sailors and Marines but also their families here at home and overseas is irreplaceable.

The work of the military chaplain is multifaceted in that they serve the troops in the field but equally as important, their wives and families supporting them on the home front. The military chaplain, regardless of service shares a common bond with their fellow soldier in the field, regardless of their religion, they are brothers-in-arms.

This work is not new either. For example, The Navy Chaplain Corps traces its inception to the Second Article of Navy Regulations adopted on November 28, 1775 by the Continental Congress. This event occurred prior to the signing of the Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776, or the Constitution on September 17, 1787. From the outset of the Continental Navy, due consideration was given to divine services and the placement of chaplains aboard ships. This act provided a place for religion and chaplains in the Navy. Additionally, the United States Army Chaplaincy was officially created by an act of the Continental Congress in July of 1775 upon the urgent request of General George Washington.

I would like to share with you part of a personal account that I recently received from a chaplain serving in Iraq: "Twice a day I go to the 'Cave' . . . the combat operations center, which is housed in a former palace, poorly lit and the hub of fighting the battle. I stand in the corner and pray for each person/position and those they represent. I don't know many of them, but God does. I pray for wisdom, strength, mercy, endurance and God's presence for each warrior, all those they serve or represent. I cover the Cave and the battlefield as I look at live imagery projected on the wall. I don't know how the Marines do it . . . but the COC is loaded with strake-looking Marines. The senior NCO's all look like NFL lineman. The junior officers look like marathon runners and the mid-grade officers look like NFL linebackers . . . the senior officers are lean, tanned and serious . . . deadly serious. The place exudes the warrior spirit. If you are a civilian I can't explain it and won't apologize for it. If you are a veteran you don't need to have it explained . . . the warrior spirit."

Mr. Secretary, you must understand, these chaplains provide so much more than spiritual guidance. They are counselors and confidantes to those who have witnessed first-hand the horrors of war. This service does not stop at the warfront; their fellow chaplains are providing the exact same service to those who mourn the recent loss of a loved one in this conflict. You need to understand the severity of this decision, their presence in the field, on ships and on base are necessities.

One of their most valuable qualities is that they are trained by the individual service that they represent. These men and women are more than just Priests, Reverends or Rabbis, they are also Soldiers, Sailors, Airmen and Marines, how can you possibly justify selecting a civilian with absolutely no

military experience to advise our troops in the field? Replacing the uniformed chaplain would be a crucial mistake. I hope you will consider these facts before you reach your final decision.

Thank you for your consideration, I look forward to hearing your decision on this matter.

Sincerely,

WALTER B. JONES,  
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I close this way because all of us in the House know that we have men and women overseas serving this great Nation in Afghanistan, Iraq, and other parts of the world who have given their lives for this country.

I close by asking God to please bless our men and women in uniform and their families. I ask God in His loving arms to hold the families who have given precious children dying for freedom. I ask God to please bless the House and Senate. I ask the good Lord three times, please God, please God, please God, continue to bless and save America.

#### DISCOUNT DRUG CARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURNS). Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, President Bush is in my home State of Ohio, campaigning for maybe the 25th time. He knows he has to spend a lot of time in Ohio because of what has happened to the Ohio economy since George Bush has been President.

Ohio's lost one-sixth, one out of every six manufacturing jobs has left the State, some 170,000 manufacturing jobs every single month in the Bush administration; but as he travels throughout Ohio, he is going to stop in Dayton and do a little program, Ask President Bush, and the members of the Ohio delegation put a list of questions we would like to ask the President about the new Medicare prescription drug discount card that the gentleman from New Jersey asked about earlier. I would like to go through some of these questions, hoping, as we pose these to the President and wrote him a letter, that we can get answers to them.

We asked the President, is it true that the Medicare law allows drug and insurance companies offering discount cards to change covered drugs and discounts weekly? Does this not mean that seniors may choose a card one week and pay for it and be stuck with it for a year that will be worth little or nothing to them the next week? We ask, if seniors are guaranteed discounts that last as little as 1 week, why must they sign up for a discount card for the entire year and only that discount card?

The \$600 annual benefit will mean a lot to very low-income seniors, but this benefit lasts only 2 years. Many of the same seniors may be unable to pass the

assets test required for the low-income benefit that will take effect in 2006.

We ask the President, why give low-income seniors help now and then pull the rug out from under them in 2 years, give them the help before the election, and after the election, the help's not there? If the Federal Government acknowledges those seniors need assistance, why are we excluding them after the Presidential election?

Ohioans can save, we found, almost 50 percent by importing prescription drugs from Canada, same drugs, same dosage, same manufacturer, from what the price is in the United States. With the cost of popular drugs rising at triple the rate of inflation, we are asking the President how he can deny seniors and all Americans access to these safe, more affordable drugs from Canada and France and Germany, when all over the world people are paying so much less.

The law creating the discount card program expressly prohibits the government from negotiating prices for prescription drugs, but the VA's price negotiation system has proven effective. We asked the President, why are America's seniors being denied the benefit of the government's buying power to leverage for lower prices?

We pretty much know the answers to these questions because this drug discount card simply will not work. The more we know about it, drug prices go up 25 percent in a year. The discount card will give maybe 10 or 15 percent. That is not price savings. That is really an insult. When we look at this, it is pretty easy to understand why.

This prescription drug bill, the Medicare bill, was written by the insurance companies and written by the drug companies for the insurance companies and for the drug companies. President Bush brought the drug and insurance companies into the Lincoln Bedroom or into the Oval Office or somewhere in the White House and let them write this legislation. It is now the law of the land that now hurts our seniors, and there is not a real surprise there when the drug industry's already given President Bush tens of millions of dollars for his reelection. The word on the street in Washington is the drug industry will donate \$100 million to the President's reelection campaign. The insurance industry is not quite as wealthy, not quite as generous, but will donate and has already donated millions of dollars to the President's reelection campaign. So it should come as no surprise that this is the kind of drug bill we get.

Then to add insult to injury, the gentleman who wrote the language in the bill dealing with the discount drug card is, number one, a friend of the President's; and, number two, he has a discount drug card company. So we have got the drug industry writing the drug bill. We have got the insurance industry helping the drug industry write the drug bill, and now we have the discount card company writing the language for the discount cards.

That is why America's seniors feel betrayed, because this Medicare bill is not for America's seniors. It is for President Bush's reelection campaign, for his fund-raising, and for those companies that are so powerful in this city.

#### ABUSE OF IRAQI PRISONERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the House delegation to the NATO Parliamentary Assembly and currently the president of the assembly, I have frequently had to reassure parliamentarians that the outrageous and false allegations they had heard about the way detainees were being treated by the U.S. at our Guantanamo detention facility were not true. Since I had been part of a small number of Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence members to visit Guantanamo, actually the first congressional delegation to visit, since the HPSCI members and staff have made several such trips and have given oversight to this interrogation and detention facility, and since I am a former military intelligence officer, I knew I could conscientiously give such an assurance.

Now, however, from Abu Ghraib prison, and perhaps from elsewhere, we have reports, with photographs, graphically telling and showing outrageous abuses of Iraqi detainees by U.S. military personnel and possibly by military contractors. The international damage to the credibility and reputation of our country and our military absolutely cannot be overstated, especially in the Arab and Islamic communities. The alleged actions by at least a few members of our military, already confirmed by very recent disciplinary action, makes the job being done by our dedicated and courageous military personnel in Iraq and Afghanistan just that much harder and much more dangerous. The extraordinary gravity of this matter, the insensitivity and the degrading abuse which has apparently been visited upon Iraqi detainees call for swift and just accountability.

What has allegedly happened is so foreign to our country's principles and traditions and those of our Armed Forces that these people conducting or condoning such abuse do not deserve to be called Americans. If the use of such tactics of physical abuse and sexual humiliation is not dishonorable conduct, I do not know what is. If supervisors of such military personnel were inappropriately unaware or unconcerned about such conduct, then this is a clear case of dereliction of duty; and this accountability should apply several levels up the chain of command. If military contractors were involved, at a minimum the contract with the firm which employed them should be immediately terminated.

Mr. Speaker, it is hard to imagine a more politically damaging set of actions, hopefully by just a few individuals, for American and for coalition efforts to replace the brutal regime of Saddam Hussein and to win the hearts and minds of the Iraqi people. We must have swift accountability, just accountability, and a demonstration that the American people repudiate such conduct and will not let it continue or happen again.

Mr. Speaker, I include an editorial at this point from this morning's Omaha World Herald.

#### UGLY AMERICANS

When U.S. soldiers at Baghdad's Abu Ghraib prison (and, some documents suggest, elsewhere) abused and humiliated prisoners of war, they committed two serious wrongs.

First, in sheer human terms, there is a code to be followed for prisoners' treatment. It exists for good reasons, starting with simple decency and progressing to the hope that rules observed by one side will be observed by the other. These soldiers trashed such considerations.

Second, they did immeasurable harm to the goals of America and its allies to bring about a peaceable and effective transfer of limited self rule to Iraqis. They rendered considerably more dubious the prospect of inculcating a stable, beneficial democracy in the Middle East. (If this is what democracy brings, who would want it?)

The six men who engaged in the actual acts (pyramids of naked detainees, false electrocution threats and more) face criminal charges. They should. In addition, six supervisors will receive a reprimand that can end their careers by rendering promotions impossible. A seventh will draw a lesser penalty.

An internal Army report in February pointed to flaws in the command structure at Abu Ghraib and elsewhere. For one thing, an intelligence officer whose duty was eliciting information from the prisoners was effectively put in charge of their day-to-day jailers—a dangerous practice, as events have shown. Additionally, the military policy responsible for the prisoners appear to have had little or no training in proper handling of detainees.

Such flaws cry out to be remedied, and apparently that will now happen. But that still leaves the question, what happened to common sense? America, for all its good intentions, is already regarded with suspicion by many in the Middle East and in Iraq in particular. Who could suppose that when knowledge of these abominable acts leaked, as was bound to happen, it would do anything less than throw gasoline on an already smoldering fire?

The United States needs to find some way to make clear in Iraq that this is not the norm, and that Americans, too, are repelled by what they saw. This isn't supposed to happen. We're the good guys. But try telling that today to the average Iraqi

#### THE CREDIBILITY GAP AND LEADERSHIP PROBLEMS OF PRESIDENT GEORGE W. BUSH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, there is a new section in

libraries and in bookstores all across America. It is called the "credibility gap and the leadership problems of President George W. Bush." There are so many books being published now that maybe the Dewey decimal system will have to be revised for America's libraries.

I recommend this new section to my colleagues and to the general public.

Last week, the latest edition to this collection was published, raising again serious questions about the President. I predict that rather than directly confront the substance of Ambassador Joe Wilson's criticism in his book, "The Politics of Truth," the White House will instead, as they have in the past, attack his motives, his character, as they have done with the critics before him.

Recent history is littered with the Bush White House smear campaigns against good and brave people, all of whom share one simple characteristic, loyalty to the truth.

Let us start with John DiLulio, the White House's director of faith-based programs in 2001. He said that the Bush administration was more focused on politics than on good policy, and he is gone.

If that sounds familiar, it is because it is the same thing the former Treasury Secretary, Paul O'Neill, said in his book, "The Price of Loyalty." O'Neill rightly warned that the massive Bush tax cut would wreak havoc with our fiscal system, and remember what the White House did after Paul O'Neill's book came out. They launched an investigation and tried to smear his credibility and his reputation. Of course, that investigation went nowhere and the book stands for what it says.

How about Richard Clarke, a trusted, lifelong bipartisan public servant who was devoted to protecting Americans against terrorism? He wrote this book, "Against All Enemies," which says the war in Iraq has diverted needed resources from the war on terror. He felt this Nation had a right to know.

Do my colleagues know how the White House responded? With a shock and awe media campaign to try and discredit Clarke. They said Clarke was just angry because he wanted a more prominent position, that he was essentially a Democrat or that he was out of the loop. Out of the loop? He was the administration's top anti-terrorist official on September 11.

If we cannot trust Richard Clarke, why not General Anthony Zinni? Zinni served in Vietnam, commanded the troops in Somalia, directed strikes against Iraq and al Qaeda, and served as the Bush administration's Mideast peace envoy. He had the audacity to agree with Clarke that the war in Iraq undermined the war on terror. He has not been asked to serve on any more diplomatic missions.

Then there was Larry Lindsey, former economic advisor to the President, who was fired when he correctly

said that the war in Iraq would cost as much as 100 or \$200 billion, but the President did not want to hear it. The administration did not want to hear it, and they certainly did not want Congress to hear it. Today, we are fast approaching \$200 billion, all of it borrowed, all of it borrowed, for the war in Iraq. Too bad for his career, because the facts were important to him. Larry Lindsey is gone.

General Eric Shinseki apparently had the same problem. He said that we might need several hundred thousand troops in Iraq to secure the peace, to secure the peace and provide for the force protection of our soldiers. The White House did not like that. Soon enough, Shinseki had stepped aside, but now we have 150,000 troops and asking for more to try and secure a peace that has been so badly compromised because of the lack of preparation by this White House. Too bad that General Shinseki decided that he had to tell the truth and was compelled to let the American people know.

But there is more. The White House threatened to fire the Health and Human Services actuary, Richard Foster, if he revealed his higher estimates of what the Medicare prescription drug bill would really cost. Instead of having an honest debate in the Congress on the real cost of the prescription drug benefit, they said, no, keep the figures from Congress. Of course, Congress voted for the bill, and now we find out it is going to cost \$140 billion more than we had anticipated. It is too bad. It is the law of the land, but it was done because of the intimidation by somebody in the administration who wanted to tell the truth.

□ 1300

Are you starting to see a pattern here, Mr. Speaker? Others have weighed in, too. Historian and political analyst Kevin Phillips says that Bush's self-interest trumps the national interest in his book "American Dynasty." Kevin Phillips is not a liberal, or a Democrat, he simply wanted to explain what was going on inside of the administration in terms of the self-dealing special interests, which brings us back to Joe Wilson.

As Members will recall, in the President's State of the Union address in 2003, President Bush said that Saddam Hussein had tried to obtain nuclear material from Africa, even though he was told it was not true; but he came to the halls of Congress to tell the American people that is what happened. Wilson heard the speech and blew the whistle. Unfortunately for Wilson, his allegiance to the truth did not just result in the character assassination of Joe Wilson. In a particularly insidious and dangerous move, someone in the White house publicly revealed that Wilson's wife was a CIA agent, putting her life at risk, ending her career, and the people she worked with. That is what happens when you try to tell the truth in the Bush administration.

## THE REAL MISERY INDEX

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURNS). Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate today to talk about the economy. Today, Chairman Greenspan is meeting with members of the Federal Reserve to determine whether to increase interest rates. Part of my talk will include excerpts from the Wall Street Journal of April 11, 2004, their editorial.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen a lot of good economic news of late. In March, the economy added 308,000 new jobs. U.S. factories have expanded for the 11th consecutive month. For the first quarter of 2004, the gross domestic product increased by 4.2 percent. It is continuing the strongest growth in 20 years.

And we have seen that Federal tax cuts of the last few years have put the United States near the top, or at the top of the advanced large economies in their growth. We have offered incentives to work, to save, and invest, according to the Joint Economic Committee.

But instead, the media have done a terrific job of convincing everybody these are the worst of times. A poll, conducted by the American Research Group in mid-March, found that 44 percent of Americans believe that the country was still in a recession. That is strange when you consider that the last recession ended way back in the year 2001. And for the last two quarters of 2003, the U.S. economy grew at an annualized rate of 6.1 percent, the fastest growth in 20 years. Even more remarkable, the percentage of gloomsters was higher in March, when we created 308,000 new jobs.

By nearly every objective measure, the U.S. economy is stronger and is getting stronger. Let us look at the Misery Index, the measure created by the late economist, Arthur Okun. He added the rates of unemployment and inflation. This may not be the most sophisticated metric to use, but it does capture the two greatest threats to household wealth and security, that is inflation and unemployment. Comparisons to the 1990s' bubble years excepted, the U.S. economy is doing very, very well.

Today's unemployment is 5.7 percent, close to the level President Bill Clinton boasted about as he sought reelection in 1996. Meanwhile, inflation has fallen by a full percentage point over the past 8 years. I have a table which indicates that the economy compares favorably by reelection standards and President Bush's policies should be enjoying at least a modicum of respect.

In 1976 under President Ford, the Misery Index was 14.5 percent. In 1980 under President Carter, it was 20.6 percent. In 1984 under President Reagan, 11.8 percent. Under Bush I in 1992, it

was 10.5 percent. In 1996 under Clinton, 8.4 percent. This year under Bush II, it is 7.7 percent. It is the lowest of all those Presidents at the time they were seeking Presidential reelection.

In conclusion, in 2003, the United States economy grew at a faster pace than the eight other largest advanced economies: Australia, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Spain, and the United Kingdom. We are seeing steady increase in manufacturing and overall productivity. Retail sales increased strongly in March, rising 1.8 percent, the largest monthly gain in a year.

In conclusion, we are seeing the economic policies of the Bush administration and the resulting action by this Congress are enabling the economy to expand, offer new jobs, new opportunities, and increase the quality of life for all Americans. That is the good news for all of us.

#### STOP GENOCIDE IN SUDAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, everyone should read Mark Lacey's piece in today's New York Times titled, "In Sudan, Militiamen on Horses Uproot a Million." The article says, "The men on horses killed my parents," referring to the militia who have been armed by the Government of Sudan. "Then the planes came," referring to aerial bombardment by the Government of Sudan. Marc Lacey writes, "Human rights groups and international officials charge that the militia has been used as a tool of the government to pursue a radical policy resembling ethnic cleansing."

The militia knows no rules of war. "They ride camels and horses and use automatic weapons against those they come across. They ride into the villages en masse and shoot anyone in sight. As the militiamen torch and loot, the villagers grab what they can and run."

One young woman did not have time to get away. She was in bed when the Janjaweed moved in. Two men entered her hut, and raped her in front of her family. Raping, then branding the survivors is common practice in this forgotten land. Refugee after refugee tells the same story. Men on horseback, air raids, soldiers sweep into villages. As this crisis rages on, 1 million people are now internally displaced, and 100,000 refugees were forced into Chad. Unknown numbers have been murdered, and the world does little.

With the rainy season just weeks away, the window for getting humanitarian assistance is closing. The international community has 6 weeks left. USAID has warned that by fall, the mortality rate will be 5 times the threshold for a major catastrophic event.

Why is the aid not getting there? The Government of Sudan continues to

stall in the issuing visas for aid workers and is preventing full humanitarian access to the region. The international community has just 6 weeks to act on their behalf.

Where are the voices of outrage? Remember Rwanda 10 years ago? Remember all of the celebrations with regard to remember Rwanda and never let it happen again. Where are the voices? Is the international community going to fail the people of Darfur, Sudan? What will the world tell those who survive? Why is the United Nations and the international community not doing more?

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Bush administration and the United States for taking the lead on this issue. Ambassador Richard Williamson gave a moving presentation in Geneva at the 60th session of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights 2 weeks ago. He laid out the facts that show that ethnic cleansing is occurring in Sudan, and what did the United Nations Commission on Human Rights do, the lone body responsible? Zero, zip. Other than the United States, very few people would even speak out on this issue.

The world must do more. We must speak out. I call on this Congress to speak out. Members who care about human rights should do all they can to help the people of Darfur in Sudan. This week the House Committee on International Relations will mark up H. Con. Res. 403, condemning the Government of Sudan for their complicity for what is happening in Darfur, and calling the international community to do the same, and urging immediate humanitarian access to the region.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, The New York Times writes about rape, pillaging, and murder on its front page. We cannot say we did not know it is happening. If we fail to act, in another 10 years Darfur will be today's Rwanda and some Member of Congress will be standing here on the floor asking those in the body at that time to remember the genocide that took place in Darfur. Is that what this world wants?

IN SUDAN, MILITIAMEN ON HORSES UPROOT A MILLION

(By Marc Lacey)

NYALA, SUDAN, May 2.—Hawa Muhammad, 15, lost just about everything when the men on horseback came. They took her family's horses, donkeys and small herd of goats and sheep. They took her cooking pots and her clothing. They took her mother and her father, too.

"The men on horses killed my parents," she said, referring to the Janjaweed, loose bands of Arab fighters. "Then the planes came."

Now it is she to whom her six younger sisters turn when their bellies rumble. She recounted her tale as if in a trance.

Hawa left her village on the run and settled with thousands of others at the camp in Kalma, outside Nyala, part of a tide of a million people that the United Nations and others say has been displaced in this vast region of western Sudan. The government in Khartoum has closed the region to outsiders for much of the last year.

Hawa's account of how the attack unfolded is the same as those heard in camp after camp across Darfur, as well as the settlements across the border in the desert of eastern Chad, where the United Nations estimates another 100,000 villagers have streamed.

Many were driven away by the Janjaweed, a few thousand uniformed militia men who have worked with government soldiers and aerial bombardments to purge villages of their darker-skinned black African inhabitants.

The government denies any relationship to the Janjaweed, but ousted villagers say the links are strong, and their accounts are backed by numerous aid workers and outside experts.

Human rights groups and international officials charge that the Janjaweed have been used as a tool of the government to pursue a radical policy resembling ethnic cleansing.

The conflict has pitted Arab nomads and herders against settled black African farmers. The tensions have been worsened by droughts in the north and the slow creep of the desert southward.

For 20 years rebels in southern Sudan have sought to topple the Arab-dominated government in the north. Two million people died in that larger conflict, and a peace agreement is considered near.

But since early 2003 two rebel groups in Darfur, the Sudan Liberation Army and the Justice and Equality Movement, initiated a separate rebellion, complaining that the region's people, especially the black Africans, were being marginalized.

Sudan's decades-old civil war was much about religion—the north is mostly Muslim, the south animist and Christian. Darfur's conflict is over ethnicity and resources; it pits Muslim against Muslim.

The rebels here scored some early victories, and the government responded with a fury, angering countries that thought it was finally taking the country toward peace after decades of civil war.

The army has used helicopter gunships and old Russian-made Antonov plane, loaded with bombs. But the Arab-African rivalry has long festered here, and the most ruthless weapon has been the mounted Janjaweed fighters, who know no rules of war.

The Janjaweed ride camels and horses and use automatic weapons against those they come across. They ride into villages en masse and shoot anyone in sight. As the militiamen torch and loot, the villagers grab what they can and run.

An empty village is an eerie place. There are no babies crying, no goats bleating, no women pounding grain into mush. The only sound comes from the wind as it whips over the huts that used to house families but now lie toppled and torched.

Today there are many such villages in the vast Darfur region. Eleven ghost villages line the main road just northwest of here. Each stands frozen, just as it was when it was overrun.

Some were cleared months ago. Others were attacked as recently as last week. In each it is clear that life came to a sudden halt. Beds are overturned, and pots lie on their sides. In front of one hut is a child's sandal, but no child anywhere.

Fatima Ishag Sulieman, 25, did not have time to get away. She was in bed when the Janjaweed moved in. Two men entered her hut. They hit her, then they raped her in front of her family.

"I screamed, and they ran away," she said in Arabic.

Ms. Sulieman and others uprooted from their homes end up in camps, some of them organized settlements and others squalid outposts. She now lives under a tree at a secondary school in Kas, in southern Darfur. All

around the schoolyard are other villagers, most of them women and children. Many of them, she says, experienced what she did.

Others suffer in different ways.

Adam Hassan, a weathered man in an equally weathered robe, described a dual attack. First it was Arab men on horseback, he said, who swooped down on his village, outside Kaliek. Then, he said, soldiers moved in.

In Mr. Hassan's case it was his two sons, ages 7 and 10, who were killed.

Mr. Hassan now stays with his wife and two surviving daughters at the Kas schoolyard. He wants desperately to return to his land and pick up again where he left off.

Like so many of the uprooted villagers, Mr. Hassan is a farmer. He relies on the heavy rains that come in June and add some life to the dusty earth. His sorghum and ground nuts keep his family alive.

But he and hundreds of thousands of other farmers in Darfur will miss this year's planting season. It is too unsafe for them to farm. That reality has aid agencies gearing up for what will be more and more hunger in the days ahead.

"I may have to stay here forever," he said at his campsite, looking glum. "There are too many Janjaweed."

The United Nations, which conducted its own tour of Darfur last week, said the crisis in western Sudan would last another 18 months—if the government managed to disarm the men on horseback soon.

But it remains to be seen whether the lawlessness will be tamed. On one recent day, men on camelback still lurked on the outskirts of an empty village outside Kas. They took off when visitors arrived.

Farther down a dirt track, a man on the back of a donkey approached another destroyed village, an assault weapon balanced on his lap.

His name was Ismael Abbakar, and he said he knew how the village had been emptied—he took, part, in fact—although he claimed to be protecting the villagers, not driving them away.

Last year, when the chaos in Darfur began spinning out of control, he was raising cattle for a living. Now, though, he is a government soldier who patrols alone with his government-issued weapon. He pulled out an identification to prove his affiliation.

In Darfur the distinction between soldier and outlaw has grown murky.

Ahmed Angabo Ahmed, the commissioner of the Kas region, acknowledged enlisting some armed robbers in the police and army to hunt down the rebels. He said his new recruits were on the side of the law now and were not Janjaweed.

"The Janjaweed are outlaws," he said.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TERRY) at 2 p.m.

## PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Lord God, Enlightenment for the world, guide this Nation by Your wisdom. Lift up the prize of this Nation, our children, and our young people. Create for them a great future by providing them with good teachers.

As Members of Congress call to mind the many teachers You have given them through the years, make us all grateful for the women and men who have shaped our ways of thinking and opened for us avenues of learning and discovery.

The Scriptures tell us, "The learned will shine like the brilliance of the firmament and those who train others in the ways of justice will sparkle like the stars for all eternity."

Bless the teachers of these United States, and reward them for their noble work, now and forever. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MOORE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

## PEER-TO-PEER SOFTWARE ENDANGERS OUR CHILDREN

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, peer-to-peer file-sharing software poses a danger to our children. At any given time, 22 million children are online sharing files on peer-to-peer networks. They usually trade music and photos. But another group of peer-to-peer users has a different agenda. Most parents do not know about it. Most kids do not have a clue.

Pornographers and child predators use these networks to expose young children to the crudest forms of pornography imaginable, much of it child porn, always disguised using innocent-sounding terms. Often, these predators attempt to arrange meetings with young people through this software. These contacts pose a significant risk to the safety of our children when they use the computer.

This week, the Committee on Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Commerce, Trade, and Consumer Protection will take up this issue. Among the solutions to be discussed is my bill, H.R. 2885, the Protecting Children

From Peer-to-Peer Pornography Act. The bill addresses the cyberdangers of file-sharing programs, like KaZaA.

Congress must act to protect children from this threat. If left unchecked, peer-to-peer networks will become the worst base of operations which child molesters, pornographers, and predators use to attack our kids in our homes online.

## SAUDI ARABIAN CROWN PRINCE BLAMING ZIONISM FOR TERRORIST ATTACKS BY SAUDIS

(Mr. LANTOS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, Saudi Arabia's Crown Prince Abdullah is blaming Zionism for recent terrorist attacks by Saudi groups in their own country. Zionism, the Crown Prince says, plays on the minds of terrorists and corrupts Saudi youth.

What an outrage. What blatant hypocrisy.

Mr. Speaker, 2½ years after the September 11 attacks, Saudi Arabia still cannot look in the mirror and face the truth. Its own extremist ideology is corroding Saudi society and exporting the damage to countless others. How ironic that Abdullah accuses Zionism, whatever he intends that word to mean, while the Saudi kingdom inculcates its young with hatred of Christians, Jews, and Western Civilization.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Prince Abdullah to retract his sickening and absurd statements, and I call on him to apologize. His real enemy is homegrown bigotry, which can only be battled by dragging Saudi Arabia into the 21st century.

## CONGRESS SHOULD PASS PERMANENT AMT TAX RELIEF

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this week we will vote on H.R. 4227, the Middle-Class Alternative Minimum Tax Relief Act of 2004. We need to pass this important bill, sponsored by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SIMMONS), to avoid 11 million taxpayers being hit with an average tax increase of \$1,520.

The AMT Tax Relief Act will ensure that this bipartisan tax relief will continue through 2005. As our economy continues its strong recovery, we must make sure that middle-income families keep more of their own money.

Without the AMT Tax Relief Act, millions of middle-income families will face a tax increase next year by being forced into paying the alternative minimum tax. Married couples will see their AMT exemption drop from \$58,000 to \$45,000. Single individuals will see their AMT exemption drop from \$40,250 to \$33,750.



I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting continued tax relief for American families. Vote "yes" on H.R. 4227.

In conclusion, may God bless our troops. We will never forget September 11.

#### PRESCRIPTION DRUG DISCOUNT CARDS

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Congressional Research Service concluded that the Bush administration broke the law when it refused to allow a career civil servant to be honest with Members of this House as to the true cost of the Republican prescription drug bill.

Since the very beginning of the prescription drug debate, President Bush and this Republican Congress have had a win-at-all-cost attitude about their prescription drug legislation. The sad fact is that the true losers in this scandal are the senior citizens, the very people Republicans claim they are trying to help.

This week, seniors nationwide will begin to see how ineffective and confusing the Republican prescription drug legislation is. This week, seniors have the opportunity to sign up for new prescription drug cards that will provide supposed savings on prescription drug costs.

But, Mr. Speaker, while some seniors will be able to save on their medications when they use these cards, many will not. In fact, I believe that these drug cards are nothing more than window dressing, a weak attempt by the Bush administration to couch the ineffectiveness of this Medicare law.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded voted or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken after 6:30 p.m. today.

#### RECOGNIZING VALUABLE CONTRIBUTIONS OF MILITARY IMPACTED SCHOOLS, TEACHERS, ADMINISTRATION, AND STAFF FOR THEIR ONGOING CONTRIBUTIONS TO EDUCATION OF MILITARY CHILDREN

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 598) recognizing the valuable contributions of military impacted schools, teachers, administration, and staff for their ongoing con-

tributions to the education of military children.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 598

Whereas there are approximately 750,000 school-aged children of members of the active duty Armed Forces in the United States;

Whereas there are approximately 650,000 of these military children served in public schools across the United States;

Whereas there are approximately 100,500 military children served in Department of Defense Education Activity schools in the United States and overseas;

Whereas schools serving military installations stress the importance of being aware of what is happening in the world and the impact of world events on the lives of military families;

Whereas schools serving military installations can provide students a sense of safety and reassurance;

Whereas schools serving military installations understand the importance of providing a normal environment and regular routine for children of parents in the military before learning can ever take place;

Whereas such schools can offer increased counseling for military children due to the deployment of family members;

Whereas such schools can offer additional counseling for staff, many of whom are spouses, parents, brothers, and sisters of deployed members of the Armed Forces;

Whereas schools serving military installations often have additional security measures in place and are continually looking at further security measures for their schools;

Whereas schools serving military installations serve students whose parents can be deployed for long periods of time and often with short notice;

Whereas teachers and counselors working in schools serving military installations are trained to work with military children and their classmates when there is a service-related incident or death;

Whereas school districts surrounding military installations can assist other school districts impacted by National Guard and Reserve deployments with support for students; and

Whereas the Impact Aid program provides support for military impacted schools in their efforts to serve students: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the contributions of the teachers, administration, and staff of Military Impacted Schools and the Department of Defense Education Activity schools worldwide; and

(2) commends the teachers in military impacted communities who work on the front lines at home to educate students during times of peace and times of conflict.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 598.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me begin by saying that on National Teachers Day, we, all of us, at every time rise to honor our teachers for their incredible contributions. Today we especially wanted to honor those teachers, staff, administrators, and all the support personnel at military impacted schools.

Mr. Speaker, I must add that you have been one of the champions of the fight for military impacted schools and increasing that amount of aid.

Mr. Speaker, the National Education Association agrees with our resolution. May I quote them: "In addition to providing the highest quality of academic support, schools serving active duty military dependents help provide students a sense of safety and reassurance by creating a normal environment and regular routine. The schools also offer increased counseling services to students and their families to help them cope with the deployment of parents, other relatives and friends. We thank you," myself and our cosponsors, "for your efforts to recognize the invaluable contributions of the thousands of teachers, administrators and staff in military impacted schools."

Mr. Speaker, I am immensely proud of the overwhelming bipartisan support for our military impacted schools. Eighty-seven Members on both sides of the aisle have cosponsored this resolution, and I have a letter of support from the NEA, clearly demonstrating this body's commitment to our military children and those that serve them. I certainly urge our colleagues to pass this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCHROCK), a captain who serves eight bases and over 400 commands in Hampton Roads, Virginia, a great military veteran and a tremendous champion of education and our military children.

Mr. SCHROCK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H. Res. 598. Life for military families is very complex, especially at times like these when one or sometimes two of the parents are off serving in the global war on terror. The burdens on caregivers, schools, and the community to counsel these children and make them feel safe and secure are great.

Though the Department of Defense, with the help of Congress, is able to compensate communities for these burdens, the sensitivity of teachers, administrators, and other educators at military impacted schools is not something we can simply write a check for and expect the issues to be addressed. I cannot overstate the importance of supporting these affected communities financially.

However, today I am here to recognize the valuable contributions the schools have in the education, comfort, and care of our military children. Children of military communities are subject to different kinds of stress than



other children. Their fear that mom and dad may not return from war cannot be comprehended by others in the community.

Educators in these areas have extra duties placed on them as they work the front lines to educate these children during times of both peace and conflict. Schools serving military installations must be aware of world events and how that can impact the lives of the children they teach.

The daily school routine helps provide military children with the feeling of safety and security. The need for normalcy is great in these communities; and educators, through their love and support of the children, help to provide that normalcy.

Approximately 650,000 public school children around the United States have parents serving in the military. The importance of supporting military impact aid for schools that serve these children is essential. Services such as increased counseling, security at the schools near military installations, and all around support can make all the difference in the lives of military children.

Today, I rise to support H. Res. 598 and to recognize the important and valuable contributions of military impacted schools, teachers, and administrations as they continue to care for our children; and I encourage all of my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I also rise in support of H. Res. 598. Today's resolution honors the role that military impacted schools, teachers, administrators, counselors, and other staff play in educating children of military families. These individuals deserve our thanks, and they deserve our support. Hard-working teachers, principals, and superintendents across the country are doing all they can to help the 650,000 military children served in public schools. They are making a difference in the lives of the children, helping them learn, helping them succeed in school and in life.

In Congress today we commend them, the parents, the teachers, the superintendents, the principals, for working on the front lines at home to educate students during times of peace and times of conflict. We should be doing all we can to support them in this important work.

Yet President Bush and the Republican Congress are not providing these children and the families with the support they deserve. Why? Because they are failing to provide adequate funding for schools serving military children. These shortcomings are even more pronounced while these children's parents, our soldiers, are defending us in Iraq, Afghanistan and around the world.

□ 1415

We need to be doing more, not less, for these children and their families.

President Bush has shortchanged children and military families in several ways. First, passing tax cuts that leave hundreds of thousands of military children behind. While millionaires receive checks averaging \$93,500 from the government, the hard-working parents of 12 million children receive nothing because Congress refused to close the loophole in the massive tax cut to the richest Americans. Even 260,000 children of active military parents were excluded from the child tax credit that the President signed.

Second, flat-funding the Impact Aid program. The Impact Aid program provides funds for schools which serve heavy concentrations of children from military families. Unfortunately, the Bush administration has failed to invest adequate resources in this program. First, by proposing to cut the program last year, and then flat-funding it in the fiscal year 2005 budget submitted only 3 months ago. Also by freezing school construction funding.

Under the Impact Aid program, school construction funding is reserved for the military school districts with the most pressing facility needs. In his fiscal year 2005 budget, President Bush proposed to freeze construction funding. Worse yet, the level of funding for school construction has declined considerably and is less than one-third of the level President Bush proposed when he entered office in 2001.

This President has also broken the promise to fund No Child Left Behind. President Bush has underfunded No Child Left Behind by nearly \$27 billion since it was enacted. Schools serving military children generally have high numbers of disadvantaged children. No Child Left Behind's funding is targeted to school districts with high concentrations of disadvantaged children.

This lack of commitment to funding hits military-impacted districts especially hard. If this budget becomes law, military children across the country will be shortchanged.

For instance, in my home State of Ohio, children in my district, the 17th congressional district, are being shortchanged. Children in Title I schools are eligible for \$574,200 in Title I funding, but the President's budget provides only \$399,000, for a shortfall of over 30 percent, nearly \$175,000. Southeast school district children are eligible for \$351,000 in Title I funding, but would get only \$241,000 under the President's budget, for a shortfall of over 31 percent.

Mr. Speaker, it is these programs and many more that are being cut by this President's budget or frozen by this President's budget.

We are going to support this resolution. We are going to support our teachers, the faculty, and the parents of these children.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I must express my disappointment in the loss of focus here today. The pur-

pose of H. Res. 598 is to honor teachers, staff, and administrators. We are not here to criticize the administration, particularly when the facts do not add up, and I will speak to that later. It is rather ironic that the former administration cut Impact Aid 8 years in a row, but we will speak about that in a minute.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, it is with great pleasure that I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES), my good friend who represents Camp Lejeune and Seymour Johnson Air Force Base.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES), my colleague, for yielding me this time, and I want to thank him for introducing this resolution 598. Again, I appreciate the fact that we will come together and vote on this resolution today as both Republicans and Democrats, because these schools, these DOD schools are exceptional in many ways.

I want to just touch on my personal experience down at Camp Lejeune. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege, as the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES) said, to have Camp Lejeune, Cherry Point, Seymour Johnson Air Force Base in my district. In Camp Lejeune, for the 10 years I have been in office, I have had many occasions to go visit the schools at Camp Lejeune, both elementary schools and senior high schools.

As fate would have it, shortly after the decision to go into Iraq, I had the opportunity to speak to the seniors in the auditorium, and I could tell that some of those young people, their faces, you could tell that they had parents who had already been deployed overseas, and I spoke to them and tried to encourage them to tell them how much we in Congress on both sides of the aisle appreciate the commitment their parents have made to this great Nation.

I mention that for this reason: I found when I was there that day that there is a special bonding among the teachers and the administration and the students at these DOD schools, this one in particular at Camp Lejeune, that there is an environment there that is cohesive to the situation that these young people are finding themselves in because their parents have been deployed. One parent, in some cases, it was 2 parents, quite frankly, who had been overseas defending freedom in Iraq and also for the American people.

There is one thing that I always wonder, is why, when something is working so well, why the Federal agency, in this case, the Department of Defense, wants, to study and see what the future of the schools needs to be? That is why I was so pleased that the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES) introduced this resolution, and again, both sides are supporting the resolution.

These schools are exceptional. These young people, time after time, when

they take national tests, the students at the DOD schools are really doing as well, if not better, in most cases, than even the public schools. I am not here to compare one school to another school, but the record speaks for itself. These young kids at the DOD schools excel when it comes to these national tests.

Also, I was touched that I had the privilege to visit the children at Camp Lejeune with special needs. I never will forget a little girl that met me in the hall when I was speaking to the teachers, and she held my hand as we walked to her class. I had a chance to observe and to talk to the teacher and to the assistant teacher as to the fine work they are doing with children with special needs at our DOD schools, again, this is Camp Lejeune.

So my friend, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES) and the others, both Democrat and Republican who are on the floor today, to say thank you to our teachers, to our principals, and to our administrators at these DOD schools, we very much appreciate the great job they are doing.

I do say, Mr. Speaker, God bless our men and women in uniform and their families and God bless America.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would also like to say to the gentleman from North Carolina, our comments today in no way take away from our ability to thank these teachers for all of their hard work. We just think that there are opportunities here that this Congress and this President could move to make this a better program, to help our children more. This is not a criticism of the teachers or principals or the teachers who are active in this program.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 598 honoring teachers in military-impacted schools.

Mr. Speaker, this is Teachers' Week, honoring all teachers, but we especially thank those who work in our communities that have large numbers of military families.

San Diego is the proud home of the largest number of Marine and Naval personnel and their families in the country. And we are all very well aware of the sacrifices of these families, including members of the Reserves and the National Guard are making as their loved ones have deployed to Iraq. Many have had their tours extended or have just returned to Iraq for a second tour. To give these members of our armed services peace of mind, it is important that they can count on their children having a stable and caring school environment.

Every one of us can surely recall how difficult it is to concentrate on our work when our lives are disrupted. For children, the anxiety of a parent leav-

ing for the battlefield for an indeterminate amount of time is especially traumatic. Having a loving teacher who understands that a child may be tense or anxious or unable to concentrate because he has just said good-bye to a parent is important, not only to that child, but also to the parents.

Nearly 40 percent of the students in Coronado, one of the communities in my district, are related to the military, with many living in housing on base. So we know that every day, teachers and administrators in the district are seriously impacted by the fact that we have many, many people serving overseas today, and they are there with loving hugs and caring for the children. Sometimes, as it has been stated here today, we undermine their efforts. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important for us not to do that, because we need to salute their efforts so that teachers, the administration, and staff in this district and every other district in the country that receives Federal Impact Aid, we say a special thank you today.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I do rise today to proudly support our Nation's teachers, administrators, and staff of military-impacted schools. Just like many of students' parents, teachers at military-impacted schools across the country report for duty each day ready to serve, but with an added mission: to keep each school day as normal as possible for students who often have much more on their minds than learning. Every day, approximately 750,000 school-age children of members of the active duty Armed Forces are at school, tasked with concentrating on their studies and faced with the reality that their mom or dad may be serving in a danger zone.

Mr. Speaker, 650,000 of these students are served by talented and caring teachers in our Nation's public schools near our military bases, while an additional 100,500 military children are served in Department of Defense education activity schools stateside and overseas.

In the 8th District of North Carolina, the school systems surrounding Fort Bragg meet together regularly to discuss the common issues affecting military children. Officials from the Department of Defense schools at Fort Bragg work alongside public schools to facilitate smooth transitions and to ensure that teachers and staff are trained and sensitive to the military needs and culture. Dr. Bill Harrison, superintendent of the Cumberland County schools, and also superintendent Joel Hansen of the DOD school on post, are working together constantly to meet the needs of these children.

Mr. Speaker, the teachers in my district do an outstanding job of serving these students and their families. They not only provide a quality education for all students, but they take the extra time and energy needed to serve our military children.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, there are several other issues here that I wanted to touch upon. One is the zeroing out of the counseling program; it was \$32 million, it has been zeroed out. Children of military families struggle to deal with a lot of the issues that are brought forth during times of war, during times of conflict. President Bush has zeroed out the elementary and secondary school counseling program. The program represents one of the few counseling efforts that the Federal Government supports, and especially as children struggle with the uncertainties facing their families in deployment during a time of war.

Also, another issue that must be touched upon here. I do not think we can have a debate about the military schools or the military impact program or any education program without looking at the whole picture. We cannot ignore IDEA. We cannot ignore No Child Left Behind. We cannot ignore construction for these facilities. We cannot ignore the counseling programs. Education is an integrated process, and by ignoring any of these, I do not think we fully touch upon the issues that we want to talk about here today.

Military-impacted districts have, on average, dealing with IDEA, more children with disabilities than non-military-impacted districts. So they are clearly going to be affected in a deeper manner than an average school, and by failing to fully fund IDEA, President Bush is exacerbating the challenges that military-impacted districts face. These districts and these taxpayers get hit twice. The government comes in, they buy the land up, they are not getting the proper amount of reimbursement from this program and, at the same time, because you have less land, you are getting an increase in your own property tax.

□ 1430

So this hits these families in these communities that more often than not need a lot of help. And I know Windham and Southeast and Maplewood in my congressional district, they need this assistance. Ohio is a State that has lost over 200,000 jobs. We need to begin to educate our kids.

No Child Left Behind has been reported by the Ohio Department of Education, a Republican-controlled general assembly, every Statewide officeholder in Ohio is a Republican, and they have said that the No Child Left Behind program is underfunded in the State of Ohio by \$1.4 billion. We cannot talk about any kind of education programs without looking at the whole pack.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, again, we have lost focus. This is about honoring our

teachers our administrators and our staff. I again would remind my colleague that that is what this is about.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) who is an outstanding Member and hard worker for our military and for their children and dependents.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, as part of National Teachers Week, it is so fitting that we commend our teachers for the work that they do. And I think it is particularly appropriate that America take time to thank the teachers and the school administrators at our military-impacted schools.

The 101 Airborne Division of the U.S. Army is stationed at Ft. Campbell in my district, in Montgomery County, Tennessee. There are 5,400 children who have at least one parent in the military and 1,700 children of civilian military employees attending the local Clarksville-Montgomery County Schools.

These schools play a central role in the lives of children whose needs are unique. As they adjust to their parents being deployed around the world defending America, the sacrifice that these children and their families make is enormous. And how fitting that we recognize that and that we recognize the teachers and the administrators who work with them teach and every day.

I know these children often have many things on their minds, many important and pressing issues on their minds, and the teachers at our military-impacted schools are important in providing a warm, friendly environment for these students.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the teachers and the staff at our military-impacted schools for their commitment to the children to their families and to our service members.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, does my colleague have additional speakers and do I have the right to close?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES) has the right to close.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, just one final closing point, and we do not need to beat a dead horse here, but I do believe that we cannot have an honest debate about this education program or any other education programs without looking at the money, and we need to fund these education programs.

Again, we commend the teachers. We commend the principles and the people who were involved in this program. And there is no doubt about the outstanding work that they provide, the outstanding leadership that they pro-

vide for our young students who are there. We will support this resolution. But, in the current fiscal year 2004 appropriations, \$61.6 million, it would take \$1.1 billion to fully fund this program.

When you look at that in the light of all the tax cuts that we have given to the top one, 2 percent of the people in this country, the wealthiest 1 and 2 percent of the people in this country, we just believe on this side of the aisle that it is time for us to take this responsibility seriously.

We are losing jobs left and right, and we want every single child to have an opportunity to get a quality education with the new facility with the proper education in these time of great need for these children.

We are supportive of this resolution. I thank the gentleman for bringing it up. It is a great idea to take time out of our busy schedules here in Congress to commend these teachers and these people who are leading the future youth of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me point out again our appreciation for the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) who has a military-impacted school association in your district and you have been a tremendous help.

I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) for his kind remarks in support of the resolution. I take a moment to simply digress to say that under No Child Left Behind, there has been a 42.5 percent increase in funding for education over the past 4 years.

We had the entire State Board of Education from North Carolina here to talk about No Child Left Behind. And ironically, Democrats and Republicans, as they should, came together to pass No Child Left Behind. What came out of this meeting was that it is very clear that people who are concerned with the outcome are working together to make sure that that destination is arrived at by all children and all teachers. And if there are issues to be dealt with, we are willing, able and eager to do that.

I also might point out as a result of No Child Left Behind, the Federal Government is currently spending more money on K to 12 than at any other time in history. Discretionary appropriations for the Department of Education rose from \$23 billion in 1996 to \$55.7 billion, 142 percent increase.

Mr. Speaker, we are not here to talk about the administration, past or present. We are here again to thank and honor those teachers and administrators and staff. These are the teachers that plan and attend Military Appreciation Days. They allow students the flexibility to attend send off and welcome home ceremonies. They coordinate letter writing campaigns for our troops and integrate academic

studies with the real world current events that impact their students. These teachers celebrate with families when a parent returns from deployment, and they weep with them when a loved one is lost. They recognize that sometimes their students deserve an extra dose of patience, sympathy and encouragement. They identify and meet those special needs.

Teachers in military impacted schools challenge students a demanding curriculum and the toughest academic standards, yet they faithfully provide the additional support that they need.

Studies show that military children move three times more than non-military. They face unique challenges, including managing school records, making new friends and adjusting to different school system policies and calendars.

Most publicly-impacted school districts also rely on impact aid for funding. Impact aid is not only the first education program, but also one of the most efficient programs the Department of Education administers. In public school, districts where the Federal Government is a primary employer-land owner, a vital tax base is lost. Impact aid payments step in to fill the gap.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to increase funding. Over the years since we have been here, every year Democrats and Republicans have worked to restore funding. Some folks do not have military installations. They do not understand this need. But we are working and we have improved it every year and that is what bipartisanship is all about.

Because of compassionate post assignments such as Ft. Bragg and Camp Lejeune, some military installations are home to substantially high number of special needs children. Schools must adjust to meet these needs and provide an appropriate education for every child.

Additionally, schools across the country that may not be near a military installation, but are home to children of National Guard and Reservists are caring for families as troops are deployed, join the remaining parent or caretaker in supporting the academic and emotional needs of students.

Military-impacted schools often employ teachers who themselves served in the Armed Forces. Reservists often live near military installations and when called to active duty, school districts must fill these temporary vacancies with another qualified interim teacher.

Mr. Speaker, the teachers, administrators and staff of military-impacted schools are some of the finest Americans I know. They serve the ones who serve. They exemplify the same fine American values that our armed services demonstrate each day, commitment, dedication and patriotism.

Mr. Speaker, please allow me a moment to recognize several organizations that play vital roles in supporting our military families, specifically, the Military Impacted School Association, National Association of Federally Impacted Schools, National Military Family Association, and the Military Child Education Coalition. They work every day to build partnerships that strengthen the educational opportunities for children. I am proud of these organizations and am dedicated to working with them to achieve our common goal.

Mr. Speaker, today, May 4, 2004, is National Teacher Day. This week has been designated National Teacher Appreciation Week by the Parent Teacher Association National Branch. Today we all tell our teachers that we appreciate their service to America's children. But specifically today, I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring the fine men and women in our military-impacted schools for their dedication to our country's children, our Armed Forces and their families.

Again, working together we have been able to raise the level of funding, and we will continue in a bipartisan fashion to do that.

I thank my colleagues for their support, their co-sponsorship, and their words of encouragement to their fine teachers and their staff. I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.Res. 598 legislation recognizing the valuable contributions of military impacted schools, teachers, administration, and staff for their ongoing contributions to the education of military children. I want to reiterate the importance of supporting our military families through the Impact Aid program, and I commend the teachers and school administrators for the outstanding work they do. This program is vital to the education of millions of children across the nation.

Impact Aid was created in 1950 when Congress recognized the obligation of the Federal Government to assist school districts and communities that experience a loss in their local property tax base due to the presence of the Federal Government. Between 1950 and 1969, the Impact Aid Program was fully funded by Congress. Since that time the funding level has not kept pace with the amount required to cover the Federal Government's tax obligation. Impact Aid funds are sent directly to the school district. The funds go directly into the school district's general fund for operations such as the purchase of textbooks, computers, utilities, and payment of staff salaries. Over 90 percent of funding for education comes from local funds such as property taxes. But what happens if that property is owned by the Federal Government and is off the tax rolls? Kids report to class with no property tax dollars needed for their school. In my district more than 1,000 students at Monmouth Regional High School, more than 1,300 students in Eatontown, and more than 1,700 in Tinton Falls are affected by impact aid. The teachers there work very hard to provide a quality education to all their students. Teachers who teach students of military families have the added burden of teaching students whose parents are or may be going overseas.

The quickest way to take a soldier or sailor's mind off their mission is to have them worrying about their children's education. Children from military families come from some of the hardest working, most patriotic families, but the schools they attend sometimes face bankruptcy. This is because of the way we fund our nation's schools. Impact Aid honors our commitment to military families. It guarantees that those families who serve to protect our freedom are in turn protected by the Federal Government. The hard working teachers of these districts ensure that these children of military members will succeed. The administrators, teachers, aids, guidance counselors, librarians, bus drivers, janitors all need to be commended for their work.

Our constitution commands that the first job of the Federal Government is to "provide for the common defense." As we improve the pay and benefits of men and women in uniform, we must also support their kids, the local schools they attend, and the teachers who teach them. The time is now to support schools that educate the children whose parents wear our nation's uniform.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 598.

Tens of thousands of men and women in uniform are serving our country around the world. I believe we owe it to them to make sure that their children here at home have access to a quality education. Teachers, staff, and administrators at schools serving our military communities are a critical part of achieving this goal. These professionals work hard to educate our youth as well as support families who are dealing with a loved one serving overseas—very often in a dangerous, combat area. That is why I am taking time today to honor these great educators for the work they do every day. The commitment of the staff at these schools is unwavering and I am proud to stand here today in support of these great Americans.

In my district, the Maryland 2nd Congressional District, schools around Fort Meade in Anne Arundel County, especially elementary schools, are feeling the pinch. The military is funding the development of 3200 new housing units on the base in the next few years. This is welcome news for military families but this initiative coupled with the fact that more military personnel are being called to duty is expected to bring 700 new students to the Anne Arundel County School System. These military families typically don't pay taxes in Anne Arundel County because their home of record is in another state. This situation is expected to overburden the school system and disrupt the system's construction and modernization plan due to this influx of new students.

As the former Baltimore County Executive, I understand the financial constraint situations like this put on local governments. I am doing everything I can here on Capitol Hill to make sure that this situation does not unfairly burden Anne Arundel County. I believe we need to fully fund Impact Aid to counties serving military children like Anne Arundel County. Impact Aid is federal assistance that helps offset the costs of educating military children when their families don't pay taxes in the area. Right now Impact Aid is only funded 60%. I believe we should completely fund the program.

The teachers, staff, and administrators at these schools do their part to educate and support these military families in this very dif-

ficult time. We in Congress must do our part and give them the resources they deserve.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in recognizing the contributions of military impacted schools. My district includes Camp Pendleton, the home of the First Marine Expeditionary Force, which has deployed to Iraq and has recently conducted major operations in cities throughout the Sunni Triangle, including Fallujah. The 1 MEF has participated in Operation Enduring Freedom, Operation Iraqi Freedom and is now serving in Iraq as part of Operation Iraqi Freedom II.

The schools that care for and educate the children of Camp Pendleton Marines provide vital educational and counseling services that have helped ease the stresses associated with this latest deployment. They provide military children with a normal daily routine—a critical need in this age when news from the front lines is brought home almost immediately.

They also have provided these children with an excellent education. Mary Faye Pendleton and San Onofre Elementary Schools, both of which are located on-base are the highest-performing schools in the entire Fallbrook Elementary School district. In addition, Oceanside Unified's three on-base schools were all recognized as California Distinguished Schools this past year.

I am proud of the teachers, administrators, staff, and volunteers of all the military impacted schools in my district. Oceanside Unified, Vista Unified, Fallbrook Elementary, Fallbrook High School, Bonsall Unified, Julian Unified, Valley Center Unified, and Warner Unified School District have all provided a great service to our men and women in uniform.

I am particularly proud of the way these schools have continued to provide quality education to these military children despite major shortfalls in federal funding for Impact Aid, which funds military impacted schools. Every year we have a budget battle over Impact Aid.

We need to remind ourselves that military impacted schools are a critical element in the support of our military families. If we are going to recognize the importance of these schools to our military men and women serving overseas, we must support them with the resources they need to do their jobs well. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to join the other co-sponsors of H. Res. 598 as we pay tribute to America's military impacted schools. It is important that we take time to honor the teachers, administrators, counselors, and other staff members of our military schools. These are the quiet professionals who report for duty each day, but carry the burden of an added mission: to provide the best possible education to students who often have much more on their minds than school work.

I extend my appreciation to Congressman HAYES for sponsoring this resolution. Too often, our military schools and the educators who fill them are taken for granted. This should never be the case. After all, the education of a military child is directly connected to the military's overall quality of life, as well as its retention and readiness.

Today, approximately 650,000 military children are served by talented and caring teachers in public schools near military bases. Another 100,500 military children attend Department of Defense Education Activity schools

here in the states and overseas. Many of these students are facing the reality that their father or mother—or both—are serving in a danger zone.

Fortunately, one thing that American troops do not have to worry about is whether their children are receiving a quality education. The educators in our military impacted schools make certain that the children of our Soldiers, Sailors, Marines and Airmen have a first-class educational experience—each and every school day.

This is our opportunity to thank the exceptional teachers, administrators, and staff of America's military impacted schools. We recognize the extra efforts they are making in these challenging times, and we are grateful. Job well done.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 598 offered by my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. HAYES. House Resolution 598 recognizes the valuable contributions of the administrators, teachers and staff who educate children of military families.

There are approximately 650,000 school-aged children of members of the Armed Forces enrolled in public schools across the United States. Another 100,500 military children are served in Department of Defense Education Activity schools in the U.S. and overseas.

While all children deserve a quality education in a stable learning environment, children of military families often face unique and stressful situations, especially in times of conflict when their parents can be deployed for long periods of time and often with short notice.

Schools serving military installations understand the importance of providing a normal learning environment and regular routine for children whose parents serve in the military. They can provide students with a sense of safety and reassurance and, a place for them to thrive academically.

Military impacted schools can also offer increased counseling for military children due to the deployment of family members, and teachers and counselors working in such schools are trained to work with military children and their classmates when there is a service-related incident or death.

I'd like to particularly recognize the Caesar Rodney School District in my home State of Delaware, which serves the families of Dover Air Force Base. The Caesar Rodney School District serves nearly 7,000 students and has a long history of academic excellence and service to its community. I would like to thank them for their commitment to serving the needs of our military children.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 598 is simple. It recognizes and commends the valuable contributions of the teachers, administrators, and staff of military impacted schools and the Department of Defense Education Activity Schools.

This resolution is also timely as this is National Teacher Appreciation Week. We not only would like to recognize the hard work and accomplishments of our military impacted schools personnel, but all elementary and secondary teachers across the country.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 598 offered by the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. HAYES. House Resolution 598 recognizes the

valuable contributions of the teachers, administrators, and staff who work hard everyday to educate the children of military families.

It's fitting that we are considering this resolution today, as this week marks National Teacher Appreciation Week. This resolution reflects our strong belief that every child in America, regardless of their military connection, deserves the opportunity to receive a quality education, and that every child should be taught by a highly qualified teacher.

The success of education reform efforts is increasingly seen as directly dependent on the quality of classroom instruction, and ensuring the quality of America's 3.2 million teachers is an essential part of providing an excellent education to all our children. A growing number of studies provide conclusive evidence that teacher quality is the primary school-related factor affecting student achievement. Students who are taught by effective and competent teachers excel quickly, while those who are assigned to the least effective teachers lag behind and often never catch up.

House Resolution 598 focuses on schools that serve our military children. These schools understand the importance of providing a normal learning environment and regular routine for children whose parents serve in the military so that they are able to learn in stressful situations, especially in times of conflict. They can also provide students with a sense of safety and reassurance while their parents are defending our freedom.

Schools serving military installations can offer increased counseling for military children when family members are deployed, and teachers and counselors working in such schools are trained to work with military children and their classmates when there is a service-related incident or death. These schools can also offer additional counseling for staff, many of whom are spouses, parents, brothers, and sisters of deployed members of the Armed Forces.

I would particularly like to thank the schools serving the children of Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in my district. The Wright-Patterson Air Force Base is the only active military base in Ohio and focuses on aviation research and development. I would like to thank them for their commitment to serving the needs of our military families.

Mr. Speaker, the teachers, administrators and staff of all our schools are the true heroes of our communities. Every child deserves an excellent education in order to gain the skills needed to continue on to higher learning, compete in the marketplace, contribute to society, and lead a fulfilling life.

This resolution rightly recognizes the contributions of the teachers, administrators, and staff of military impacted schools, and Department of Defense Education Activity schools world-wide and we praise the teachers in military impacted communities who work on the front lines at home to educate students during times of peace and times of conflict.

I would like to thank Mr. HAYES for his leadership in bringing this bipartisan resolution forward and urge my colleagues to vote in support of this resolution.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the basketball capital of the nation, Storrs CT home of the University of Connecticut Huskies. For the first time in NCAA history, one school has brought home both the Men's and Women's Division I Basketball titles in the same year.

I would like to offer special congratulations to Head Coaches Jim Calhoun and Geno Auriemma. This is Coach Calhoun's second National Championship. For Coach Auriemma, this is his third consecutive championship and fifth overall. Both men are outstanding coaches who exemplify leadership and commitment to our young people.

Mr. Speaker, this is an extraordinary group of young men and women. We could spend hours telling you about each one of these marvelous student athletes. Since we don't have that much time, I want to take a moment to tell you a little about All Americans Emeka Okafor and Diana Taurasi.

Emeka Okafor the Co-National Player of the Year, is not only a stellar shot blocker, he is graduating from UCONN as a Junior with his degree in Finance and carries a 3.8 GPA. Earlier this year he was named Kodak Academic Player of the Year. Emeka is a genuine role model for our children.

Diana Taurasi was recently named the national women's Player of the Year and the Final Four Most Outstanding Player. As a senior at UCONN, she led the Huskies to three consecutive national titles—and finished her college career with a team-high 17 points in the championship game.

Coach Auriemma told his team before the game that in the early 90's the team played in its first championship game before a crowd of roughly 1,500 people. On April 6th the Huskies defeated the University of Tennessee Volunteers in front of a crowd of over 15,000. Mr. Speaker I think its safe to say that Title IX is alive and doing well in Storrs Connecticut.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and all of our colleagues to join me in honoring these two tremendous teams.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 598.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### CONGRATULATING CHARTER SCHOOLS FOR THEIR ONGOING CONTRIBUTIONS TO EDUCATION

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 600) congratulating charter schools and their students, parents, teachers, and administrators across the United States for their ongoing contribution to education, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 600

Whereas charter schools deliver high-quality education and challenge our students to reach their potential;

Whereas charter schools provide thousands of our families with diverse and innovative educational options for their children;

Whereas charter schools are public schools authorized by a designated public entity and are responding to the needs of our communities, families, and students and promote

the principles of quality, choice, and innovation;

Whereas in exchange for the flexibility and autonomy given to charter schools, they are held accountable by their sponsors for improving student achievement and for their financial and other operations;

Whereas 41 States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico have passed laws authorizing charter schools;

Whereas nearly 3,000 charter schools are now operating in 37 States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and serving 750,000 students;

Whereas over the last 10 years, Congress has provided more than \$1,000,000,000 in support to the charter school movement through facilities financing assistance and grants for planning, startup, implementation, and dissemination;

Whereas charter schools improve their students' achievement and stimulate improvement in traditional public schools;

Whereas charter schools must meet the student achievement accountability requirements included by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, and contained in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, in the same manner as traditional public schools, and often set higher and additional individual goals, to ensure that they are of high quality and truly accountable to the public;

Whereas charter schools give parents new freedom to choose their public school, charter schools routinely measure parental satisfaction levels, and charter schools must prove their ongoing success to parents, policymakers, and their communities;

Whereas nearly 40 percent of charter schools report having a waiting list, and the total number of students on all such waiting lists is enough to fill over 1,000 average-sized charter schools;

Whereas charter schools nationwide serve a higher percentage of low-income and minority students than the traditional public system;

Whereas charter schools have enjoyed broad bipartisan support from the Administration, the Congress, State Governors and legislatures, educators, and parents across the United States; and

Whereas the fifth annual National Charter Schools Week, to be held May 3 to 7, 2004, is an event sponsored by charter schools and grassroots charter school organizations across the United States to recognize the significant impacts, achievements, and innovations of charter schools: Now, therefore, be it—

*Resolved, That—*

(1) the House of Representatives acknowledges and commends charter schools and their students, parents, teachers, and administrators across the United States for their ongoing contributions to education and improving and strengthening our public school system;

(2) the House of Representatives supports the fifth annual National Charter Schools Week; and

(3) it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to conduct appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities to demonstrate support for charter schools during this week long celebration in communities throughout the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER).

GENERAL LEAVE

□ 1445

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 600.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 600, a resolution congratulating charter schools across the United States and their students, parents, teachers and administrators of such schools for their ongoing contributions to education.

Charter schools represent a grand experiment which relies upon innovation and creativity found within American society. Since charter schools are often small and independent, they are able to focus on new approaches for teaching and preparing students for their place in our rapidly changing world. Charter schools often deliver high-quality education and challenge students to reach their potential. Charter schools can be vehicles for improving student achievement and for stimulating change in all educational settings including public schools.

Almost 2,700 charter schools serve students across the Nation, and these schools are found in 41 States, Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia. In Michigan, there are over 210 operational charter schools and even more approved to open during the 2004-2005 school year.

I would especially like to commend one innovative and entrepreneurial charter school pioneer in my district, Mr. J.C. Huizenga. He founded National Heritage Academies in 1995 with a vision to create a network of K-8 schools that offer a common-sense approach to education. The cornerstones of this approach include rigorous academics, a strong virtue-based character development program, active parental involvement, and a high degree of accountability.

Mr. Huizenga and his National Heritage Academies operate 39 schools in 5 States and serve nearly 21,000 students.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting and congratulating charter schools.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to take a few moments to respond to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) regarding the extraneous comments he inserted in the debate on the previous measure. He commented that the legislature in Ohio and others there agree that No Child Left Behind is underfunded.

Mr. Speaker, I served in the Michigan legislature for 11 years. During all that time, I never met any legislator who ever felt that the Federal Government was properly funding or overfunding anything.

It is the character of State legislators and State legislatures to believe that the Federal Government should be sending them more money. That simple statement about the Ohio legislature is no indication whatsoever of the truth of the situation.

The truth is that Federal funding for education has more than doubled over the past 8 years. The truth is that if we look at the charts of the funding under No Child Left Behind of this Congress and compare it with the funding under the previous program, we are doing extremely well. It is almost an exponential increase compared to the relatively flat funding prior to that.

Similarly for IDEA funding; if we look at the history of that, IDEA funding was struggling along at a few billion dollars per year for a number of years. Since the Republicans took over, we have quadrupled the amount of funding for IDEA to \$10 billion in fiscal year 2004.

The facts are, the Republicans have been very generous with the funding of No Child Left Behind and IDEA, and attempts to say otherwise are simply falsifying the facts and I think are for political purposes and should not have been inserted in the discussion of the military schools debate.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

The gentleman from Michigan makes a valid point. We are spending more on education, but there are more mandates that have been placed on these local schools, and the money that we have given has not equaled the amount that is needed to fulfill the obligations that the Federal Government wants to impose on the local school districts and the States.

I was in the State legislature, too. I know State legislators want more Federal money; there is no doubt about that, and I apologize to the gentleman from Nevada. We are getting a little off the point here, but my point was that here we have a Republican-controlled legislature, we have a Republican State for the most part controlled by Republican-elected officials, soon to become a Democratic State in the fall, but a Republican State controlled, and my point is that the Department of Education in Ohio is not going to throw it back in the Republican Congress' face and criticize them unnecessarily so. So if anything, it was a proper analysis of the funding that was needed.

Back to H. Res. 600. I do rise, Mr. Speaker, in support of H. Res. 600, a resolution congratulating public charter schools for their ongoing contribution to our educational system.

The first charter school opened its doors in 1992 in Minnesota; and since that time, the number of charter schools has grown. While they only educate a small portion of all children that attend public schools, these schools have added to the importance and purpose of our public school systems. The truly great aspect of our

country's educational system is its public schools. Whether it is charter schools or traditional public schools, all of our public schools exist to educate our Nation's children.

America cannot succeed without a robust and successful public school system. Charter schools are one important part of this system.

I do want to say that this is not a resolution of us agreeing to abandon the traditional public schools, abandon funding for the traditional public schools at both a local, State level, and at Federal level. This is not that resolution.

We do want to commend all the hard-working teachers and principals and leaders in the schools and the kids who go to these schools as students who attend. They are great kids. I have had an opportunity to meet with them and speak with them. They are great kids who deserve all the respect and admiration that this body can give them.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 600. This resolution honors and congratulates our Nation's charter schools and the students, parents, teacher administrators, and other individuals involved for their hard work and dedication to providing a quality public education. This week, May 3 through May 7, has been designated National Charter School Week. It is during this week that charter school organizations and others around the United States honor these schools for their continued contributions to education.

The Nation's charter schools deliver high-quality education and challenge students to reach their potential. Forty-one States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico have passed laws authorizing charter schools. Since the first charter school law was passed in 1991, almost 3,000 charter schools now serve nearly 750,000 students in 37 States and the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico.

Specifically, I am honored to mention the 14 charter schools in Nevada that serve nearly 3,000 students. Nevada first passed charter school legislation in 1997, with our first charter school opening in the 1998-1999 school year. The State charter school legislation was revised again in 1999, lending teachers more room for creativity in allowing charter schools the ability to offer an extended school day, as well as an extended school year.

I commend the charter schools in the State of Nevada and across the Nation for recognizing the immense need for improved education and for their commitment to improving student achievement for students who attend these schools. At charter schools nationwide, almost half the students are considered at-risk or are former dropouts. Charter schools serve significant numbers of

minority students, students with disabilities, and students that are from lower-income families. These schools give opportunity and freedom to students and parents who otherwise might not have had the chance to receive a quality education.

Nearly 40 percent of charter schools report having a waiting list, and the total number of students on all such waiting lists is enough to fill another 1,000 average-size charter schools across the country. By allowing parents and students to choose their public school, charter schools can stimulate change and improvement in all public schools and benefit all public school students.

In exchange for flexibility and autonomy, public charter schools are held accountable by their sponsors for improving student achievement and for their administration. Charter schools respond to the needs of America's communities, families, and students while promoting the principles of quality, choice, and innovation. Charter schools must meet the same No Child Left Behind student achievement accountability requirements as other public schools and often set higher and additional individual goals to ensure that they are of high quality and truly accountable to the public.

Charter schools have enjoyed broad bipartisan support from the administration, the Congress, State Governors and legislatures, educators and parents across the Nation. The fifth annual National Charter Schools Week held this week, May 3 through May 7, recognizes the significant impacts, achievements, and innovations of our Nation's charter schools. Through this resolution, Congress today acknowledges and commends the charter school movement and charter schools, students, teachers and parents and administrators across the United States for their ongoing contributions to education and improving and strengthening our Nation's public school system.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time and for his work in bringing this bill forward and the gentleman on the other side as well.

I strongly support this resolution. The first Federal bill for charter schools was a bill for the District of Columbia only. I worked with Newt Gingrich on this bill when he was Speaker and when he knew that the District of Columbia opposed vouchers. Instead, he worked with me on a charter school bill, and charter schools took off in the District of Columbia as they have in no other jurisdiction today.

The District of Columbia has the largest number of charter schools. I

could not be more proud of these schools. They are an alternative public school system. They are accountable to us in the same way that the District of Columbia public schools are.

This morning in the other body in the Senate, a hearing was held on charter schools in our city as a part of the D.C. appropriation. The interesting thing about the voucher fight that took place just a few months ago is that my own constituents who came in to see me, who wanted vouchers, many of them said to me that the reason that they were supporting a voucher bill is that there was such a long line of backlog in the charter schools that they did not believe their children could get into the charter schools.

I then begged the Congress to give any extra money it had to our charter schools since our council had passed a bill in favor of charter schools, our council was giving money to charter schools; and, instead, the Congress decided to make the District of Columbia the only jurisdiction in the United States to have vouchers imposed on it while the Congress itself has refused to impose private school vouchers on the country.

I invite the Congress to visit the charter schools of the District of Columbia and come see what a public school system can do in addressing the need for alternatives to public schools, as I believe there are. There are people who oppose charter schools. I think that is an unacceptable position. If, in fact, the public school the child attends is not satisfactory to that parent, there should be a public school alternative for that parent. That is exactly what the District of Columbia has. A series of public school alternatives, side by side, are our public schools.

I am proud of Arts and Technology, SEED, Friendship Edison, Cesar Chavez, Carlos Rosario, Tree of Life, Capital City, Howard Road, and KIPP to name just a few of the charter schools in the District of Columbia. We have almost 1,400 youngsters attending D.C. charter schools. The next time my colleagues want a voucher, if they come and see the charter schools in the District, they will get cured of that disease.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Nevada for the wonderful work that he has done on this resolution and for his support of charter schools. I am pleased to join him in cosponsoring this legislation and serving as an honorary cochairman of the National Charter School Week. The growth of charter schools across our country in recent years has allowed us to see firsthand the difference that these schools can make in children's lives.

In 2002, while I was a member of the Tennessee State Senate, we passed legislation allowing for the creation of



public charter schools. That was signed into law in Tennessee that year. The legislation allowed for the creation of the first four public charter schools, which opened their doors in our State in 2003. These schools have had a great start, and I am looking forward to seeing the establishment of more charter schools in Tennessee.

Unfortunately, some traditional schools fail to serve some students, and charter schools have proven to be a great alternative for many of these students. Fifteen different studies show that students frequently enter charter schools significantly below grade level and then progress at or above the gains being made in surrounding districts and demographically comparable schools or with their State averages.

National Charter School Week is a great opportunity for us to talk about the success of charter schools and the success that they are having in meeting the needs of our children and their families and the success that they are having in encouraging children to become lifelong learners.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to add my voice in supporting the tremendous work the charter schools are doing all across this land, and I want to commend the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER) for the work he is doing to help foster the charter school movement.

In Wisconsin, I am proud to say that movement is growing by leaps and bounds. My State was among the very first to enact the charter school law in the early 1990s; and in line with our proud tradition of local leadership and public education, our charter schools are flourishing.

In fact, we have gone from one charter school in 1994 to 134 this year. Over 20,000 Wisconsin students are now enrolled in these charter schools. The Appleton School District, in my own congressional district, alone has nine such charter schools. That is how much we care about creating educational opportunities for all families.

One of the most exciting charter schools in Wisconsin is called Wisconsin Connections Academy. It is quite literally a public school without walls. The State's virtual K-8 elementary school is enrolling students from all across Wisconsin.

□ 1500

The Academy's mission is to help each student maximize his or her potential and to meet the highest performance standards. This Academy is on the cutting edge of education reform, offering a uniquely individualized learning program that combines the best in virtual education with very

real connections among students, families, teachers and the community. They have taken public education into their own hands, and good things are happening. They have grown from 200 students to 400, and they have received 800 applications for this year.

Mr. Speaker, here in Washington, we must stand ready to help. We must work to remove unnecessary barriers that hold back our charter school innovators, and we should work to unleash the great progressive potential that charter schools represent. Congratulations not only to the Wisconsin Connections Academy, but to all charter schools across the country that are making a very real difference in our children's future.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). The gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER) has the right to close.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We support this resolution. We appreciate the gentleman's efforts on this. I want to make perfectly clear that we want to show our support and congratulate the public charter schools for their contributions to the system, and say what great students and kids they have, and how we want to support them and their families. This is not a resolution to abandon our traditional public schools, but to show our support for charter schools.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Education and Workforce Committee, as well as co-chair of National Charter School Week, I strongly support the H. Res. 600, legislation honoring the fifth annual National Charter Schools Week.

Public schools are America's commitment to providing a high quality education for every child. I am dedicated to ensuring that all children have the opportunity to receive a quality education regardless of what public school they attend. This includes charter schools, which are models of successful education reform and one of the fastest growing education innovations working to improve our public education.

As a National Co-Chair of Charter Schools Week, I would like to take a minute to celebrate the first decade of Charter Schools in the United States. Traditionally, charter schools are independent public schools, designed and operated by educators, parents, community members and others. Since the first charter school began operation in 1992 in St. Paul, Minnesota, the number of charter schools has grown to nearly 3,000 serving 750,000 students around the country in 37 states, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

Charter schools have consistently been at the forefront of my priority list, and I am pleased that Wisconsin has 137 exceptional charter schools. In my congressional district alone, we have over 24 charter schools presently and that number grows each year. I have consistently advocated for increased funding for charter schools and supported the Charter

School Facilities Financing Demonstration Program during consideration of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize that charter schools give parents options when determining the best public school in which to enroll their children. Thus, we must ensure that all our students reach their highest academic potential, which may require attending a charter school that provides a model better suited towards an individual student's needs.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here today to speak about the benefits of charter schools and their ability to deliver high-quality education and challenge our students to reach their potential. Charter schools provide thousands of our families with diverse and innovative educational options for their children.

I recently had the pleasure to visit a charter school in my district, KIPP 3D Academy. KIPP stands for Knowledge is Power Program, and this is an innovative approach to education which has been making a significant impact all over the country. Charter Schools are a unique opportunity for students to access other methods of education, and after visiting with the 3D Academy students, I can see how excited they are for learning.

Charter schools are public schools authorized by a designated public entity and are responding to the needs of our communities, families, and students and promote the principles of quality, choice, and innovation.

In exchange for the flexibility and autonomy given to charter schools, they are held accountable by their sponsors for improving student achievement and for their financial and other operations. During my visit to KIPP 3D Academy, I was able to see their substantial progress with their students, and how their strict curriculum embodied their slogan that Knowledge is Power.

Nearly 3,000 charter schools are now operating in 37 States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and serving 750,000 students.

Charter schools improve their students' achievement and stimulate improvement in traditional public schools. They also give parents new freedom to choose their public school, charter schools routinely measure parental satisfaction levels, and charter schools must prove their ongoing success to parents, policymakers, and their communities.

Charter schools nationwide serve a higher percentage of low-income and minority students than the traditional public system. These schools have enjoyed broad bipartisan support from the Administration, the Congress, State Governors and legislatures, educators, and parents across the United States.

The fifth annual National Charter Schools Week is May 3 to 7, 2004. This event is sponsored by charter schools and grassroots charter school organizations across the United States to recognize the significant impacts, achievements, and innovations of charter schools. I am pleased to join my colleagues in the House of Representatives to acknowledge and commend charter schools and their students, parents, teachers, and administrators across the United States for their ongoing contributions to education and improving and strengthening our public school system.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H. Res. 600, congratulating charter schools and their students, parents, teachers,

and administrators across the United States for their ongoing contributions to education. This week is the fifth annual National Charter School Week and provides a great opportunity for Congress to recognize and honor charter schools and those involved for the role they play in reforming and improving our nation's public education system.

Charter schools are public schools that agree to improved academic achievement and accountability in financial and other operations, in exchange for increased flexibility and independence. The greater autonomy allows charter schools to focus on increasing academic achievement in each student, rather than bureaucratic paperwork. Charter schools must meet all the same No Child Left Behind achievement goals as other public schools.

Charter schools are adept at meeting the specific needs of the local community in which they are located, especially in low-income communities. Nationwide, almost half of charter schools serve students considered at-risk or who have previously dropped out of school. Charter school students share similar demographic characteristics with students in all public schools, and serve significant numbers of students from low income families, minority students, and students with disabilities.

This being the case, charter schools allow many parents and students freedom of choice that otherwise would not be available, enabling them to improve their lives with a quality education. In addition, increased flexibility allows charter schools to use varied educational methods and techniques while still remaining accountable for results.

Charter schools have benefited from a strong degree of bipartisan support from the local, state, and national levels. This is evidenced by the efforts of both Republicans and Democrats in Congress when they expanded access to charter schools through the No Child Left Behind legislation. In the two years since the enactment of that legislation, Congress and the President have provided at least \$200 million dollars annually to assist in the financing of new charter schools and to provide additional aid to existing schools.

It is important for Congress to recognize, through this resolution honoring National Charter Schools Week, the benefits charter schools and those involved have brought to our education system and to our nation at large. I thank my colleague from Nevada, Mr. PORTER, for introducing this resolution, and I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H. Res. 600. This resolution recognizes National Charter Schools Week and honors charter schools and those involved for providing a quality education to children from thousands of families across the United States. The fifth annual National Charter Schools Week is May 3 through May 7, and it is during this week that we make it a point to acknowledge and celebrate charter schools.

With the enactment of the No Child Left Behind Act, Congress built on the existing opportunities for families and students that charter schools allowed and increased both access and funding for these institutions. Charter schools are public schools that give families additional freedom. These public schools have flexibility and independence from certain regulations, but submit to the same or higher accountability requirements regarding student achievement.

Beginning in 1991 with one school, charter schools have grown in prevalence in nearly every State in our nation. Currently, there are almost 2,700 schools serving nearly 3,000 students. In my home State of Delaware, we first passed a charter school law in 1995. We now have 13 charter schools, serving over 5,000 students. Delaware charter schools serve students at both the elementary and secondary levels, and stimulate change and improvement in public schools at all levels.

In communities of all types throughout Delaware and our nation, charter schools teach students using a variety of methods and techniques, often succeeding in situations that might appear to some to be less than ideal. For example, the East Side Charter School, located in the East Lake village of Wilmington, Delaware enrolls a student population in which 88 percent of the students qualify for free or reduced price lunch, yet produces academic results that exceed those of the other public schools in Delaware.

Charter schools have enjoyed a considerable amount of bipartisan support from every level, including the Administration, Congress, State governors and legislatures, local communities, parents, and teachers. During National Charter School Week, it is important to demonstrate this support by honoring and commending charter schools, and their students, parents, teachers, and administrators through this resolution and other programs, ceremonies, and activities.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the National Charter Schools Institute's 2004 Colloquium taking place in Brighton, Michigan on May 7, 2004. The NCSI 2004 Colloquium is a celebration of the families, teachers, local leaders and others who chose charter public schools because of their proven ability to help our nation's school children attain academic and personal success.

The National Charter Schools Institute has joined together with sponsors and supporters including the Michigan Department of Education, the Michigan Council of Charter School Authorizers, the Michigan Association of Public School Academies, the Black Alliance for Educational Options and the Programs for Educational Opportunities to bring this Colloquium to Brighton to benefit charter school representatives throughout the state of Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, America's charter schools are our partners in our quest to provide a quality education to all of our children. I would like to ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the benefits of the National Charter Schools Institute 2004 colloquium to the school children of Michigan, and to ask them to join me in celebrating National Charter Schools Week.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 600, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### RECOGNIZING BENEFITS AND IMPORTANCE OF SCHOOL-BASED MUSIC EDUCATION

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 380) recognizing the benefits and importance of school-based music education, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas school music programs enhance intellectual development and enrich the academic environment for students of all ages;

Whereas students who participate in school music programs are less likely to be involved with drugs, gangs, or alcohol and have better attendance in school;

Whereas the skills gained through sequential music instruction, including discipline and the ability to analyze, solve problems, communicate, and work cooperatively, are vital for success in the 21st century workplace;

Whereas the majority of students attending public schools in inner city neighborhoods have virtually no access to music education, which places them at a disadvantage compared to their peers in other communities;

Whereas local budget cuts are predicted to lead to significant curtailment of school music programs, thereby depriving millions of students of an education that includes music;

Whereas the arts are a core academic subject, and music is an essential element of the arts; and

Whereas every student in the United States should have an opportunity to reap the benefits of music education: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That—*

(1) it is the sense of the Congress that music education grounded in rigorous instruction is an important component of a well-rounded academic curriculum and should be available to every student in every school; and

(2) the Congress recognizes NAMM, the International Music Products Association for its efforts to designate a Music in Our Schools Month in order to highlight the important role that school music programs play in the academic and social development of children.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Con. Res. 380.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 380 which highlights the benefits and importance of school-based music education. I would like to thank the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) for their leadership on this issue, and for introducing the resolution we are considering today.

Research has shown that students' involvement in their school music program is critical to a complete education. Musical study develops critical thinking and self-discipline skills, and improves a child's early cognitive development, basic math and reading abilities, self-esteem, SAT scores, ability to work in teams, spatial reasoning skills, and school attendance.

In an analysis of United States Department of Education data on more than 25,000 secondary school students, researchers found that students who report consistent high levels of involvement in instrumental music over the middle and high school years show "significantly higher levels of mathematics proficiency by grade 12," regardless of a student's socioeconomic status.

A 1999 report by the Texas Commission on Drug and Alcohol Abuse found that individuals who participated in band or orchestra reported the lowest levels of current and lifelong use of alcohol, tobacco, and illicit drugs. So it is not surprising that children involved with music education are more likely to graduate from high school and attend college and are less likely to be involved with gangs and substance abuse.

In fact, many colleges and universities view participation in the arts and music as a valuable experience that broadens students' understanding and appreciation of the world around them.

For these reasons, I support H. Con. Res. 380, which recognizes the benefits and importance of school recognizing the benefits and importance of school-based music education. The resolution before the House today is simple and straightforward. It states that it is the sense of the Congress that music education grounded in rigorous instruction is an important component of a well-rounded academic curriculum and should be available to every student in every school.

It also recognizes the International Music Products Association for their efforts to designate a Music in Our Schools Month in order to highlight the important role that school music programs play in the academic and social development of children.

Music in Our Schools Month began as a single statewide celebration in 1973, and has run over the decades to encompass a day a week; and in 1985, March was designated as a month-long celebration of music in our schools.

I would like to thank two organizations that have played an important role in promoting the benefits of music

education, the International Music Products Association, commonly called NAMM, in reference to the organization's popular NAMM trade shows. It is a not-for-profit association that unifies, leads, and strengthens the \$16 billion global musical instruments and products industry. NAMM's activities and programs are designed to promote music making to people of all ages.

The National Association For Music Education, the world's largest arts education organization, addresses all aspects of music education. Nearly 90,000 members represent all levels of teaching from preschool to graduate school. Since 1907, the Association has worked to ensure that every student has access to a well-balanced, comprehensive, and high-quality program of music instruction taught by qualified teachers.

Music education is important to our children. It can broaden and strengthen their education and improve their lives. I commend music educators and music organizations across the country for the key roles they play in helping our children succeed in school and throughout life.

As former President Gerald Ford said, "Music education opens the doors that help children pass from school in the world around them, a world of work, culture, intellectual activity, and human involvement. The future of our Nation depends on providing our children with a complete education that includes music."

I urge my colleagues to support music education in our schools and H. Con. Res. 380, which highlights the benefits and importance of school-based music education.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I support this resolution which honors the importance of school-based music education. Specifically, this resolution recognizes that music education, grounded in rigorous instruction, is an important component of a well-rounded academic curriculum, and should be available to all students. It also recognizes that school music programs play an important role in the academic and social development of children. Any music educator will tell you that the school music program enriches the academic environment of our schools, and also enhances the intellectual development of our children. Music education is very important. I am pleased to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER), and more specifically, from Music City, U.S.A.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I do have the privilege of representing Nashville, Tennessee, and outlying communities

in the United States Congress, and we commonly go by the name Music City, U.S.A. We are very proud of that because we may have more creative individuals in our area than perhaps any other community of the world. Some say that everyone who lives there is either a musician or a songwriter, and some just haven't cut their demos yet.

We are very proud of that musical tradition and heritage, and we believe music should be included in the curriculum in our public schools. Music education is vitally important, not only for the reasons that my two colleagues have given, and I would also like to thank the original cosponsor of this legislation, the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) for his strong support.

Music education I think is even more important than the reasons that have been given so far. When our Founders started talking about the values of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, surely in the pursuit of happiness, they were talking about music. Music is literally the joy of life, the soundtrack of our lives. It accompanies our most important and most intimate moments. Whether it is a tune or a lyric that you carry in your heart forever, that is an important part of being fully human. It is also an important part of our educational system. A shocking number of our young people, some 30 million or more, are being deprived of this music education. They are being deprived of a well-rounded education.

Many Americans have seen the movie called "Mr. Holland's Opus" in which Richard Dreyfuss played a high school music teacher who did a superb job over decades teaching young people how to play an instrument in a band, how to appreciate music, and develop their minds and hearts to the fullest extent. Of course in that movie, Mr. Holland's job was terminated because the local school board did not think music was important. They considered it a luxury rather than a necessity.

But I think all thinking Americans realize music is important, it is not a luxury, it is a necessity, and it is very important for our young people to learn those skills. The music historian Jules Combarieu said, "Music is the art of thinking with sounds." I hope that all of our young people will be able to learn to think with sounds and learns how to play a musical instrument.

The International Music Products Association deserves a lot of credit for helping focus our attention during this month on the needs of our students who need the ability to learn a musical instrument.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the many Members of this House who strongly support this resolution. I would like to thank the members of this committee who brought forward this measure with unusual speed using an unconventional mechanism, and we appreciate the recognition of music as a key part of our public education.

However, it is very important that we do not just pay lip service to this

goal because there is no funding in this bill. This is a concurrent resolution. This just encourages, this just asks the many school districts around the country to include music as a priority. Let us make it real. Let us make sure that our public schools do have music education in the curriculum and that all of our children around this great Nation have the chance to learn the sound of music.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, again, I want to reiterate our support and thank the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER) for his leadership on this particular piece of legislation and also all of his work as far as encouraging music in our schools. We have stories abound about famous musicians who have stumbled onto music class somehow or other. One story I am familiar with is Boyd Tinsley, the famous violinist from the Dave Matthews Band. He started off in a middle school strings class, and the rest is history. The next thing we know, we have one of the premier violinists in the history of the world. We want to encourage this, but I also agree with the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER). We want to take this to the next level.

□ 1515

We cannot rely on organizations like Save Our Music to try to help encourage this. This is our government. We understand the importance of the arts. We understand the importance of the stamp of approval that the Federal Government has. I think we also want to start putting our money where our mouth is on this issue. I thank the gentleman from Nevada and the gentleman from Tennessee and all who were involved in this. We are going to support this resolution.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 380, legislation recognizing the benefits and importance of school-based music education. I am proud to join my colleagues in passing this bipartisan proposal today in the House of Representatives.

As a teacher, I can testify to the value that music and art can have in a well-rounded academic program. There is a growing body of scientific research demonstrating that children who receive music instruction perform better on spatial-temporal reasoning tests and proportional math problems.

Opportunities in music and the arts have also enabled children with disabilities to participate more fully in school and community activities.

There is something special about music and the arts that speak to what is special and unique in the human spirit. Music and the arts can motivate at-risk students to stay in school and become active participants in the education process. They teach all students about beauty and abstract thinking.

According to the College Board, college-bound high school seniors in 1998 who received music instruction scored 53 points

higher on the verbal portion of the Scholastic Aptitude Test and 39 points higher on the math portion of the test than college-bound high school seniors with no music or arts instruction.

Other data show that individuals who participate in band or orchestra reported the lowest levels of current and lifelong use of alcohol, tobacco, and illicit drugs. Comprehensive, sequential music instruction assists brain development and improves cognitive and communicative skills, self-discipline, and creativity.

Mr. Speaker, music education enhances intellectual development and enriches the academic environment for children of all ages. I am proud to join with my colleagues in passing this bipartisan resolution in recognition of these facts.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 380, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### CONGRATULATING UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT HUSKIES FOR WINNING 2004 NCAA DIVISION I MEN AND WOMEN'S BASKETBALL CHAMPIONSHIPS

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 599) congratulating the University of Connecticut Huskies for winning the 2004 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I men and women's basketball championships.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 599

Whereas the University of Connecticut is the first school to win both the men and women's Division I basketball National Championship titles in the same year;

Whereas the University of Connecticut Huskies men's basketball team won its second National Collegiate Athletic Association championship by defeating Georgia Tech by the score of 82-73;

Whereas the University of Connecticut Huskies women's basketball team won its fifth National Collegiate Athletic Association championship by defeating the University of Tennessee by the score of 70-61;

Whereas Emeka Okafor was named Co-National Player of the Year, National Defensive Player of the Year, and the Final Four Most Outstanding Player;

Whereas Diana Taurasi was named the national women's Player of the Year, the Final

Four Most Outstanding Player and received the Nancy Lieberman Award;

Whereas University of Connecticut Huskies men's head coach Jim Calhoun has led his team to two National Championships in six years, making him one of just seven coaches to ever win two titles during his coaching career;

Whereas University of Connecticut Huskies women's head coach Geno Auriemma has led his team to three consecutive National Championship titles, only the second coach to accomplish this feat, and five titles overall.

Whereas the high caliber of the University of Connecticut Huskies in both athletics and academics has significantly advanced the sport of college basketball and provided inspiration for future generations of young men and women alike; and

Whereas the University of Connecticut Huskies' championship season has rallied Connecticut residents of all ages behind a common purpose and triggered a wave of euphoria across the State: Now, therefore, be it *Resolved*, That the House of Representatives commends the University of Connecticut Huskies men's and women's basketball teams for winning the 2004 National Collegiate Athletic Championships.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SIMMONS) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SIMMONS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 599.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today with all of my Connecticut colleagues to honor the 2004 NCAA Division I men and women's championship basketball teams from the University of Connecticut, our University of Connecticut Huskies. This resolution recognizes these teams for their outstanding performances in this year's men's and women's tournaments and the University of Connecticut for being the first school ever to win both championship titles in the same year.

Mr. Speaker, every day the people of Connecticut face tough choices when they get up in the morning. Are they going to wear their men's championship T-shirt, or, alternatively, are they going to wear their women's championship T-shirt? Gosh. It is hard to make that decision because we love them both. But you cannot wear two T-shirts at once. So my constituents in Connecticut have come up with a third T-shirt, a T-shirt that celebrates the men's and the women's national championship titles. And such is the solution for the day. I will wear this one which commemorates both of my favorite teams in one T-shirt.

We have the same difficulty when it comes to Sports Illustrated. Shall we

read about the women Huskies and their championship, or shall we read about the men Huskies and their championship? Thank goodness for Sports Illustrated. They have given us both wonderful stories in one volume. It is just a question of picking where you begin.

Needless to say, all of us from Connecticut are excited about our teams. This year the men's basketball team captured the NCAA championship by defeating Georgia Tech by the score of 82-73. The team was led by Coach Jim Calhoun, who is just one of seven coaches in NCAA history to win two Division I titles in his career. Also this year, the UConn women's basketball team won the NCAA championship by defeating the University of Tennessee by a score of 70-61. Under the direction of head coach Geno Auriemma, this victory marks the third consecutive national championship and the fifth overall for the Lady Huskies. Coach Auriemma is only the second coach in NCAA history to achieve three consecutive titles.

There are many outstanding players and coaches who achieved this amazing double victory, but I will mention no names. The reason for that is because I remember a story told by Coach Geno Auriemma about the women's uniforms, the Connecticut Huskies women's uniforms. If you look carefully at the photographs, you will see that on the back of the uniforms, there are no names. Individual stars are not recognized with names on the uniforms. The reason for that is because Coach Auriemma believed that the success of the squad cannot be attributed to one individual but, rather, to the collective effort of the whole team.

I believe the victories of these two teams cannot be attributed to one person but to every player, every coach, and indeed every fan who participated in the 2004 season. These wins are not only important to the people involved but also to the University of Connecticut itself which happens to be located in my district, and I happen to have been honored to be a teaching assistant at the university for 4 years.

The university was founded in 1881 as an agricultural college in the small town of Storrs nestled in rural northeastern Connecticut. It was established through the philanthropy of two brothers, Charles and Augustus Storrs, who donated 170 acres of land with farm buildings, an orphanage and a cash donation to pay for equipment. From these humble beginnings, the University of Connecticut has blossomed into a premier research university, one of the top 25 in the country. The university has a rich history of providing educational opportunities for undergraduates of diverse interests, ability, and backgrounds. And as well, they have very substantial graduate programs.

I know that the entire State of Connecticut is proud of all the players, the coaches, the students, and the faculty

at the University of Connecticut. And now I would like to join my fellow fans in the famous Huskies cheer:

U-C-O-N-N. UConn-UConn-UConn.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I also would like to congratulate the gentleman and the University of Connecticut. I will not be participating in the cheer, however. They were very exciting games and a very exciting year for the University of Connecticut. I rise in support of this resolution. I notice that the gentleman does have a few extra T-shirts over there that I will be more than pleased to take off his hands if he needs to get rid of any of those extra ones.

I extend a hearty congratulations, too, to both of the head coaches, both Coach Calhoun and Coach Auriemma. It is just fantastic. One, the excitement of the Final Four and the college basketball tournament. There is nothing in professional or collegiate athletics like the Final Four and the road to the Final Four. Again, we congratulate you. We will let you boast throughout the day today without being bitter at all.

I want to just say, the great sportsmanship, the excellent play, the great strategy and tactics of both coaches, it was very, very enjoyable to watch. It was a great year. I look forward to the Ohio State Buckeyes maybe participating in a little better fashion next year.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON).

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding me this time. I would like to associate myself with his remarks and those of my colleague from the Second Congressional District in Connecticut. We are indeed so proud in Connecticut; in fact, you could say that we are in a state of euphoria with the outstanding achievement by the men's and women's basketball teams. Randy Smith, the great sports journalist for the Journal Inquirer in Connecticut and perhaps one of the greatest sportswriters in this country, remarked, "The poets contend that April is the cruelest of months, but the poets never met Diana Taurasi or Emeka Okafor or the UConn Huskies."

What an extraordinary time this was. What exemplary teams, the kids that participated and played on those teams, their coaches and, of course, the great fans of Connecticut. Connecticut was able to overcome in so many respects what is commonly referred to as a curse at the start of a season when they were both named preseason to be the number one teams in men's and women's basketball respectively. So to have that burden placed on you and that expectation at the outset of a season is quite a challenge. You immediately become the target of what in

collegiate sports has become the most competitive of our sports, basketball. As was noted by the gentleman from Ohio, when you look at March Madness and see how it reverberates in this Chamber and throughout the country, you get to understand and appreciate the enormous task that these kids faced and their coaches in their fulfillment of a dream that was extraordinary.

I further would like to acknowledge the teams that they played against as well. The majesty that we have come to know as collegiate athletics is such that the victories that you achieved are enhanced by the competition that you play along the way.

In the Final Four, both Minnesota and Tennessee distinguished themselves as outstanding teams in that tournament on their way to the women's Final Four, two teams that Connecticut was able to defeat. By defeating them, because of the competition and because of the great play and the heart of both of those teams makes the Connecticut victory even greater. The same is true in the men's game, with victories over both Duke, an extraordinary program in history and college basketball, and Georgia Tech. Both teams played extraordinarily throughout the tournament. Again, Connecticut's victory is only that much greater by the competition that it faced and the wins they were able to achieve during those games.

I would like to also point out that the great poet, Arthur O'Shaughnessy, used to say, "For each age there are dreams that are fading and dreams that are coming to birth." The dream is now fading as we had a huge parade in Connecticut with more than 350,000 people pouring out to see our victorious champions, but it is also one that is coming to birth as child after child, as I observed the parade, could hear them cry out and point out to their mothers and fathers, there's Diana Taurasi, there's Emeka Okafor, there's Ben Gordon, there's Coach Auriemma, there's Coach Calhoun. They become full of the same kind of dreams that these coaches and athletes were able to execute on the courts.

□ 1530

And we think, quite frankly, without putting undue pressure on them that they will be able to continue to perform at the highest of levels.

I especially want to acknowledge two people who know more about the ups and downs of this team, the ins and outs of Connecticut basketball, who, in fact, live it daily, and I guess one could say nightly as well. They often do not get the credit that they deserve and perhaps are not mentioned as frequently as they should be as well, but we can see them nightly in the stands watching and observing; and with each steal, with each turnover, with each made basket and blocked shot, their aspirations and those for the team that they root for go up and down with the great fans of Connecticut.

But they are also notable for what they do beyond the basketball court and their countless contributions to charitable organizations, and I am referring, of course, to the spouses, Pat Calhoun and Kathy Auriemma, and I want to especially salute them.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding me this time.

I thank the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SIMMONS) for introducing this resolution. It is truly an honor for us to be here today, and it is an honor for us to be talking about the Connecticut Huskies, about men and women and their unbelievable demonstration of prowess and camaraderie on the basketball court. These are the teams that made the champion season. With the first sweep of the NCAA basketball championships in the same year, both the men and women were successful. The same college, they have made history, and in the process, they have inspired legions of young people to aspire to their excellence and to their remarkable example of teamwork.

The people of Connecticut are tremendously proud of their Huskies. Our women's team has now won three straight national titles, four in 5 years and a remarkable 18 straight NCAA tournament games. Through it all, they have been led by Diana Taurasi, a three-time All-American, twice named the Most Outstanding Player of the Final Four, once the National Player of the Year, and now the first overall pick by the Phoenix Mercury in this year's WNBA draft.

A fellow daughter of Italian immigrants, Diana Taurasi will be remembered as one of the best players in the history of women's basketball. But their 70-to-61 victory over the Tennessee Lady Vols was without question a team effort. And the Tennessee Lady Vols are an outstanding women's basketball team. Diana scored 17 points, Jessica Moore and Ann Strother scored 14 points, Barbara Turner another 12 points, in addition to nine rebounds, four assists, two steals, and two blocks.

And Derby, Connecticut's own Maria Conlon had seven points, knocking down four straight foul shots in the final minutes to seal the victory. It is no wonder she was called by "Sports Illustrated" not only a "terrific shooter," but someone who "gives hope to every woman everywhere." To the Huskies, Maria brought her own brand of quiet but steady leadership.

In every respect this was a team championship, making our Huskies an inspiration to young girls everywhere. And I may add that the Huskies have once again illustrated for us the results of Congress's commitment, through Title IX, that when given the resources, women are just as talented

and as exciting to watch as any men's team out there, and if the Members do not believe, believe ESPN.Com's Pages 2 column, which called the UConn women's basketball team the very best sports team in the world right now.

We have come to expect this sort of success from the women's Huskies team, but the performances by the men's team in their one point win over Duke in the Final Four and their 82-73 victory over Georgia Tech for their second NCAA championship were equally as dominating. In fact, since the tournament bracket expanded to 64 teams in 1985, UConn became just the third school to win multiple championships.

It was another inspiring story, this one led by the son of Nigerian immigrants. Emeka Okafor was the obvious selection for the tournament's Most Outstanding Player award, scoring 24 points and hauling in 15 rebounds in the title game.

And by graduating a year early to enter the NBA draft, but doing so with a degree in finance, Okafor's efforts remind us how excellence in academics and athletics often go hand in hand. No wonder he is now first college basketball star ever awarded a personal locker in the Basketball Hall of Fame at the end of his collegiate career.

Two remarkable stories, two historic teams, but one indomitable spirit. I want to congratulate the Huskies and their coaches on their championship wins, their incredible seasons, and their inspirational teamwork and commitment. They have earned our recognition and our respect. Way to go, Huskies.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) from Connecticut's District 4.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my Connecticut colleagues. This is really an extraordinary opportunity for us. I join the entire State of Connecticut in congratulating the University of Connecticut Women and Men Huskies for becoming the first school, ever to have both their college basketball programs win the NCAA National Championships in same year. It is extraordinary. Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely extraordinary.

The Male Huskies overcame early adversity in winning their second national championship since 1999. Despite several injuries, the UConn Huskies simply would not be denied their second national championship in 5 years. Led by Academic and Athletic All-American Emeka Okafor, junior sensation Ben Gordon at shooting guard, senior leader Taliek Brown at point guard, sharp shooter Rashad Anderson at forward, and freshman force Josh Boone, the Huskies were a force to be reckoned with.

I would also like to commend the hard work, the extraordinary work, of Jim Calhoun. He has given us years of tremendously exciting basketball. I commend him for so many things but

also to say he overcame prostate cancer to become one of only three active coaches to win multiple national championships. The Huskies demonstrated quickness, great outside shooting, and stifling defense; but in the Final Four in San Antonio, they demonstrated their greatest trait, resilience. They made us a little nervous, but they demonstrated their extraordinary resilience.

Despite trailing 41 to 34 at half-time in the semifinal game against Duke, our nemesis, I think of that last-second shot and feel like they have gotten their just desserts since then. The Huskies battled back, led by Okafor's rebounding and his 18 points to win the game 79-78. I just love it. It was an amazing afternoon.

In the national championship game, the Huskies played nearly flawless basketball to beat the Georgia Tech Yellow Jackets 82 to 73.

The perennial champion UConn Lady Huskies won their third straight national championship and fourth in 5 years. That is a dynasty. It is an extraordinary dynasty. The Lady Huskies, led by one of the greatest women players ever to play the game. In fact, my staff said one of the greatest. I want to say the greatest. No one close. Diana Taurasi and her fellow starters, Ann Strother, Jessica Moore, Barbara Turner, and Maria Conlon, would not be denied a three-peat. Unlike the previous 2 years, the Lady Huskies had to battle back from early season setbacks to finish the season as the number one team again.

I would also like to commend Geno Auriemma, who has put together a streak of unbelievable seasons. He is only the second coach ever to win three straight national championships, and he has five championships total. In the national championship game, the Huskies jumped out to a 17 point lead and managed to hold off perennial opponent, the University of Tennessee, eventually winning the game 70 to 61.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate these young men and women not only for their tremendous basketball ability but also for being such extraordinary role models for Americans of all ages. I am so proud of each and every one of them. I truly am just in awe of what good kids these young men and women are. They have made us proud. They have given us extraordinary exciting times, and there is always the anticipation that there is more good to come in the future. Right, I ask the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SIMMONS)?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON).

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding me this time.

I again want to join with my colleagues in what is a euphoric day for us to be on this floor. I see the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) is here, and I just wanted to again commend the



team from Georgia Tech that did beat us at the very start of this year, and we learned from that experience, and I do think that what we have witnessed here in this country, there is such a great love for collegiate sports throughout the country, and rightfully so, at all levels and in all sports. But I think we have established a new standard here, and it is something that I think is historic, and that is why these victories themselves present one for the ages.

Just like we had Ruth's 60 home runs, the DiMaggio hitting streak, the UCLA 10 basketball championships, the men's American hockey team victory over Russia, this standard that has been set where both the division one men and women's team win successively on back-to-back nights, national championships will become the new standard for all collegiate sports to aspire to, especially, as is in the case of basketball, where both men and women's teams play.

So this is an exceptional accomplishment. For the women, as has been pointed out by both the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), the outstanding job that they have done to do this three times in a row and to have the fifth championship that the Geno Auriemma has been able to bring home to the State, extraordinary, and Jim Calhoun's second championship as well. This truly was one for the ages. It is one that we will truly enjoy and appreciate long throughout our lives and only can aspire to try to achieve that goal again, but what a goal and what a standard to strive for.

And the academic success of our athletes should be pointed out as well. The gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) mentioned that Emeka Okafor was named the Most Outstanding Player of the tournament, and indeed he was and demonstrated that time and time again, but he also is an example for all students all across this country about academic excellence. Graduating in 3 years with a 3.7 grade average speaks highly of the quality of the individuals that come to the University of Connecticut, participate in their athletics program, and succeed in the manner that Emeka Okafor has as well. So it is a wonderful tribute to a great university, to a tremendous State, and I am just honored to be on the floor here this afternoon with our colleagues to talk about that.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Earlier in my comments, I mentioned the fact that I would not be naming individual members of the team because I wanted to make the point that for Coach Auriemma and for the Lady Huskies, individual performance is less important than team performance.

□ 1545

But my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from the First District of

Connecticut (Mr. LARSON), and my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), and my colleague, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), have also pointed out the historic nature of the accomplishment, the historic nature of the accomplishment, that, until this year, the men's and women's championships have not been won by any single college or university in history, in history.

On that basis, I think it is appropriate that I include for the RECORD the full roster of the men's team and the full roster of the women's team.

#### 2003-04 WINTER WOMEN'S BASKETBALL ROSTER

Number, Name, Year, Position, Height, Hometown High School:

- 2, Ashley Valley, Jr., G, 5-9, Colchester, VT/Rice Memorial.
- 3, Diana Taurasi, Sr., G/F, 6-0, Chino, CA/Don Lugo.
- 4, Kiana Robinson, Fr., G, 5-8, Brandon, FL/Laurinburg Institute (NC).
- 5, Maria Conlon, Sr. G, 5-9, Derby, CT/Seymour.
- 12, Stacey Marron, Jr., G, 5-9, Albuquerque, NM/La Cueva.
- 20, Morgan Valley, Sr., G, 6-0, Colchester, VT/Rice Memorial.
- 21, Nicole Wolff, So., G, 6-0, Walpole, MA/Walpole.
- 22, Ashley Battle, Jr., F, 6-0, Pittsburgh, PA/The Linsly School.
- 23, Willnett Crockett, So., F/C, 6-2, Harbor City, CA/Narbonne.
- 31, Jessica Moore, Jr., C, 6-3, Palmer, AK/Colony.
- 33, Barbara Turner, So., F/G, 6-0, Cleveland, OH/East Technical.
- 34, Liz Sherwood, Fr., C, 6-4, Castle Rock, CO/Highlands Ranch.
- 43, Ann Strother, So., G, 6-2, Castle Rock, CO/Highlands Ranch.

#### 2003-04 WOMEN'S BASKETBALL COACHING STAFF

Head Coach: *Geno Auriemma* 19th Season at Connecticut (West Chester '81).

Associate Head Coach: *Chris Dailey* 19th Season at Connecticut (Rutgers '82).

Assistant Coach: *Tonya Cardoza* 10th Season at Connecticut (Virginia '91).

Assistant Coach: *Jamelle Elliott* 7th Season at Connecticut (Connecticut '96).

Director of Basketball Operations: *Jack Eisenmann* Third Season at Connecticut.

#### 2003-04 WINTER MEN'S BASKETBALL ROSTER

Number, Name, Year, Position, Height, Weight, Hometown High School:

- 31, Rashad Anderson, So., G/F, 6-5, 190, Lakeland, FL/Kathleen.
- 11, Hilton Armstrong, So., F/C, 6-10, 210, Peekskill, NY/Peekskill.
- 24, Jason Baisch, Jr., F, 6-6, 250, Southbury, CT/Pomperaug.
- 21, Josh Boone, Fr., F/C, 6-10, 230, Mt. Airy, MD/West Nottingham Academy.
- 33, Denham Brown, So., F, 6-5, 205, Toronto, Canada/West Hill Collegiate.
- 12, Taliek Brown, Sr., G, 6-1, 200, Queens, NY/St. John's Prep.
- 40, Justin Evanovich, Sr., G, 6-3, 195, Ann Arbor, MI/E.O. Smith (CT).
- 4, Ben Gordon, Jr., G, 6-2, 195, Mount Vernon, NY/Mount Vernon.
- 32, Ed Nelson, Jr., F, 6-8, 265, Fort Lauderdale, FL/Georgia Tech.

50, Emeka Okafor, Jr., F/C, 6-9, 252, Houston, TX/Bellaire.

2, Ryan Swaller, Sr., F, 6-5, 208, Milford, CT/Foran.

13, Ryan Thompson, Jr., F, 6-6, 215, Gold Coast, Australia/W. Nebraska C.C.

30, Shamon Tooles, Sr., G/F, 6-5, 225, Coatesville, PA/Coatesville.

3, Charlie Villanueva, Fr., F, 6-11, 230, Brooklyn, NY/Blair Academy (NJ).

23, Marcus White, So., F, 6-8, 215, Chicago, IL/Whitney Young.

5, Marcus Williams, Fr., G, 6-3, 200, Los Angeles, CA/Oak Hill (VA) Academy.

#### 2003-04 MEN'S BASKETBALL COACHING STAFF

Head Coach: *Jim Calhoun* 18th Season at Connecticut (American International, 1968).

Assistant Coach: *Tom Moore* 10th Season at Connecticut (Boston University, 1987).

Assistant Coach: *George Blaney* 3rd Season at Connecticut (Holy Cross, 1961).

Assistant Coach: *Clyde Vaughan* 2nd Season at Connecticut (Pittsburgh, 1984).

Director of Basketball Operations: *Andre LaFleur* 3rd Season at Connecticut (North-eastern, 1988).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). Does the gentleman wish to submit the T-shirts and hats?

Mr. SIMMONS. The T-shirts and hats will not be submitted for the RECORD, because, as I indicated earlier in my statement, I wear them around when I am at home. The hats I know I am not allowed to wear in the Chamber, but I will display them; and Members of the body can come and admire them later today, if they so desire.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume just to say I have been proud to be part of the Connecticut delegation here today.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the University of Connecticut Men's and Women's basketball teams for this historic double championship wins in the 2004 NCAA Tournament. Today, thanks to men and women of the Huskies, Connecticut is a state of champions.

Earlier this month, the nation learned what the people of Connecticut knew long ago: the skill and sportmanship of the UConn Huskies is the stuff of legends. After the ups and downs of the regular season, UConn went on to dominate the NCAA tournament and emerged as the first school to win both the men's and women's tournaments in the same season. On April 6, 2004, the Husky men brought home their second national title with an 83-72 win over the Georgia Tech Yellow Jackets. The next night, the Lady Huskies went on to beat the Lady Vols of the University of Tennessee, 70-61, fulfilling yet another historic achievement by being the second team to capture three consecutive national titles.

This has been an unprecedented year for the Huskies, and Jim Calhoun, Geno Auriemma, Chris Dailey, Tom Moore, George Blaney, Clyde Vaughan, Andre LaFleur, Tonya Cardoza, Jamelle Elliott, Jack Eisenmann, and the entire UConn basketball program should be commended for their unmatched leadership and pursuit of excellence on and off the basketball court.



Once again this year, the men and women of the Huskies have proven themselves to be the best players in the country. Players like Emeka Okafor and Diana Taurasi personify the skill, hard work and dedication it takes to succeed. I know that I join many UConn fans when I say that I look forward to watching Diana play for the Phoenix Mercury, and wish Emeka and Ben Gordon luck in the NBA draft this summer.

The men and women of the UConn Huskies have long been a source of pride for the State of Connecticut. Their success is a reflection of the very best qualities of our student athletes, and will no doubt inspire young boys and girls in our state and across the country to achieve their goals.

Not only do the huskies have the best players in the country, they have the best and most dedicated fans. For proof of this, one needs to look no further than the crowd of 300,000 excited UConn fans that lined the streets of Hartford for the Husky victory parade this past Sunday. The size of the crowd, roughly three times the city's own population, clearly demonstrates that the Huskies have a special place in the hearts and minds of the people of Connecticut.

I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to the UConn men's and women's basketball teams and celebrating their success. They are truly a credit to their families, to their University, to the great state of Connecticut, and to the nation as a whole.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SIMMONS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 599.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### CONGRATULATING UNIVERSITY OF DENVER MEN'S HOCKEY TEAM FOR WINNING 2004 NCAA MEN'S HOCKEY NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 408) congratulating the University of Denver men's hockey team for winning the 2004 NCAA men's hockey national championship, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 408

Whereas on Saturday, April 10, 2004, the University of Denver men's hockey team won its 6th national hockey championship, their first such win since 1969;

Whereas the team was led by goaltender Adam Berkhoel, who finished the game with

a shutout, only the 3rd shutout in hockey national championship game history; the first occurring in 1968 when the University of Denver beat North Dakota by a score of 4-0;

Whereas Adam Berkhoel made 24 saves in the 2004 championship game and was named Most Outstanding Player of the Frozen Four;

Whereas Gabe Gauthier scored the 2004 championship game's only goal in the first period, assisted by Connor James;

Whereas the Pioneers kept the Black Bears scoreless despite a 3-man advantage for Maine with 2 minutes to go in the 3rd period;

Whereas the roster of the Pioneers' 2004 team also included Max Bull, Ryan Caldwell, Matt Carle, J.D. Corbin, Lukas Dora, Jeff Drummond, Glenn Fisher, Jon Foster, Luke Fulghum, Jussi Halme, Michael Handza, Ryan Helgason, Jon James, Greg Keith, Danny King, Matt Laatsch, Nick Larson, Scott McConnell, Brock McMorris, Ted O'Leary, Jeff Rogers, Brett Skinner, Kevin Ulanski, and Adrian Veideman;

Whereas Head Coach George Gwozdecky and his coaching staff, including Assistant Coach Steve Miller, Assistant Coach Seth Appert, Director of Hockey Operations David Tenzer, and Volunteer Assistant Coach Chris LaPerle, deserve much credit for the outstanding determination and accomplishments of their team; and

Whereas the students, alumni, faculty, and supporters of the University of Denver Pioneers are to be congratulated for their commitment and pride in their 2004 national champion men's hockey team: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—*

(1) congratulates the University of Denver men's hockey team for winning the 2004 NCAA men's hockey national championship;

(2) recognizes the achievements of all the team's players, coaches, and support staff and invites them to the United States Capitol Building to be honored;

(3) requests that the President recognize the achievements of the University of Denver men's hockey team and invite the team members to the White House for an appropriate ceremony honoring a national championship team; and

(4) directs the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make available to the University of Denver enrolled copies of this resolution for appropriate display and to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to each coach and member of the 2004 NCAA men's hockey national championship team.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 408, which congratulates the University of Denver's men's hockey team for winning the 2004 NCAA men's hockey national championship.

On Saturday, April 10, 2004, the University of Denver men's hockey team won its sixth national hockey championship by defeating the University of Maine 1 to nothing. The University of Denver had previously won five national titles in a 12-year span between 1950 and 1962, but this year's championship was their first since that time.

It was an exciting game, with the Denver Pioneers keeping the Maine

Black Bears scoreless, despite a three-man advantage for Maine with 2 minutes to go in the third period of the match.

The game was just the third shutout in NCAA hockey championship history, and the announced crowd of 18,597 was the largest to watch a hockey game in the Fleet Center, which is the home of the NHL's Boston Bruins.

Adam Berkhoel, Denver's goalie, made 24 saves in the 2004 championship game and was named the Most Outstanding Player in the Frozen Four, which is the finals for the NCAA hockey matches.

The resolution before the House today congratulates the University of Denver men's hockey team, its players and coaches, for winning the 2004 NCAA men's hockey national championships, and recognizes the achievement of all the team's players, coaches, and staff.

Indeed, Denver University, the citizens of Denver and Colorado and all the students of the university are to be congratulated for their commitment and the great pride they take in this great accomplishment by winning the NCAA hockey championships.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 408, a resolution congratulating the University of Denver for winning the NCAA hockey national championship. Just last month, the Pioneers captured the national championship after a hard fought Frozen Four. This championship culminated in an impressive season. College fans, student athletes, and the general public were treated to an exciting final game.

I want to extend my hearty congratulations to Head Coach George Gwozdecky. Also to be congratulated are a number of players, Adam Berkhoel, who made 24 saves. I also want to extend my congratulations to North Dakota, who, despite their loss, showed the quality of their school and their athletic talent through great sportsmanship.

Winning this championship has brought national acclaim to the University of Denver. I hope the Pioneers' fans and the university community treasure this moment for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 408.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**CONGRATULATING KENNESAW STATE UNIVERSITY OWLS FOR WINNING 2004 NCAA DIVISION II MEN'S BASKETBALL NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP**

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 594) congratulating the Kennesaw State University Owls for winning the 2004 NCAA Division II Men's Basketball National Championship, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 594

Whereas on March 27, 2004, the Kennesaw State University Owls defeated the University of Southern Indiana Screaming Eagles in Bakersfield, California, to win the 2004 NCAA Division II Men's Basketball National Championship;

Whereas 2004 marks the Kennesaw State University Owls' first NCAA Division II Men's Basketball National Championship;

Whereas the Kennesaw State University Owls won their final 26 consecutive games and achieved a 35-4 season record in the 2003-2004 season;

Whereas the Kennesaw State University Owls were undefeated in the Peach Belt Conference in the 2003-2004 season, and they became the first team from the Peach Belt Conference to win the Division II National Championship;

Whereas the Kennesaw State University Owls were led to victory by Head Coach Tony Ingle, Assistant Coaches Jeff Jones and Stace Tedford, Graduate Assistant Greg Matta, Bench Coach Ron Smith, Student Assistant Tony Ingle, Jr., and Head Athletic Trainer Karen Pfeifer;

Whereas the Kennesaw State University Owls' team of outstanding players, including Will Davis, Darrell Fisher, Terrence Hill, Israel Ingle, Georgy Joseph, Kenan Knight, Rey Luque, Kevin McDonald, Reggie McKoy, Taylor Patterson, Tobias Seldon, Cardale Talley, Justin Thompson, and Tommy Thompson contributed extraordinary performances both throughout the regular season and during the postseason in the Peach Belt Conference Tournament and the NCAA Division II Men's Basketball Tournament;

Whereas the Kennesaw State University Owls' senior guard Terrence Hill, who CBS named the game's Most Valuable Player, was critical to the team's championship, scoring a game-high 26 points and making 8 of 16 field goal attempts, including 4 of 7 attempts at 3-point shots;

Whereas Kennesaw State University, located in Kennesaw, Georgia, is headed by President Betty L. Siegel and has an enrollment of 15,600 students; and

Whereas the Kennesaw State University Owls men's basketball team has brought great pride to Kennesaw State University, the city of Kennesaw, and the State of Georgia: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) congratulates the Kennesaw State University Owls for winning the 2004 NCAA Division II Men's Basketball National Championship;

(2) recognizes the contributions of the Kennesaw State University Owls' players, coaches, staff, faculty, families, and supporters in winning the 2004 NCAA Division II Men's Basketball National Championship;

(3) commends the city of Kennesaw, Georgia, for its enthusiastic support of the Kennesaw State University Owls; and

(4) hopes that the high academic and athletic standards set by the Kennesaw State University Owls will continue to inspire fans

and young players around the world by producing student athletes of a high caliber.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to thank the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON), who about two debates ago acknowledged the Georgia Tech Yellow Jackets who unfortunately lost in the NCAA finals to the great University of Connecticut basketball team. Today, we are on the floor acknowledging the champions, but, really, all of those in higher education who compete in the NCAA.

I am pleased to author and ask this House to consider its bipartisan support for H. Res. 594, which commends the Kennesaw State University Owls men's basketball team for winning the NCAA Division II national championship.

Kennesaw State won the last 26 games of its season, finished with a record of 34 and 5, and defeated the University of Southern Indiana Screaming Eagles in Bakersfield, California, by a margin of 84 to 59 in the national championship game.

This great university and its great athletic program won the Peachbelt Conference Championship for the 2003-2004 season. Head Coach Tony Ingle, who was named the Naismith Co-Coach of the Year in Georgia, along with Paul Hewitt of Georgia Tech, led Kennesaw State University to a truly outstanding year.

All-American Terrance Hill, who was selected All-American, one of the top 15 NCAA basketball players in the United States of America, was also chosen the most valuable player in the final game against Southern Indiana.

The Kennesaw State University Owls have a great athletic program, and this victory is a great tribute to their effort; but I think it is important when we talk about athletics that we talk about it in the context of student athletics as well, and this resolution affords me an opportunity to talk a little bit about this great university, which is celebrating its 40th year.

Forty years ago, two representatives from the State of Georgia, Representative Joe Mack Wilson and Representative Al Burruss, both of whom are not with us now but did a great job for so many years in the legislature, spawned the idea that with Atlanta's growth it was important to have an urban commuter college to support the universities that were in the area; and thus Kennesaw State College, at that time, became one of the 34 units of the university system of Georgia.

Their first president, Dr. Horace Sturgis, started that college on a shoe-string on property donated by the Fry family, leading citizens of the community of Kennesaw.

From its humble beginning, Kennesaw State has grown to university status, and now has almost 19,000 full-time residential and commuter students studying medicine, studying nursing, studying business, and studying education. The academic achievements of its graduates is renowned in Georgia, and its graduate executive MBA program has been recognized in national publications as one of the finest in the country.

Dr. Horace Sturgis, its first president, was succeeded by Dr. Betty Siegel, its second president, who continues as president of this university now for more than 20 years. It is under her leadership that participation in athletics and NCAA status have helped to raise the visibility of that university, while at the same time it has remained committed to outstanding academic achievement and providing outstanding academic studies for those residents of the greater metropolitan area, and now, truly, the entire Southeast.

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege and pleasure for me to present H. Res. 594, commending Kennesaw State University's NCAA men's basketball champions, and also to commend all the universities and colleges in the NCAA who produce student athletes who go on into life to act as leaders in their communities and continue the great tradition of the NCAA.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution and want to thank the gentleman from Georgia, congratulating Kennesaw State University for winning the NCAA Division II men's basketball national championship.

Two months ago, the Owls captured this title, culminating in a very impressive season. Kennesaw State won their last 26 games. Unbelievable. College fans and student athletes and the citizens of the State of Georgia were treated to a very exciting basketball season.

I just want to extend my congratulations from the great State of Ohio. It is obvious that the gentleman from Georgia has great passion about the influence that student athletes can have on the future of our society and on the future of the State of Georgia, and I want to rise in support.

Ms. MAJETTE. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to offer my congratulations to the Kennesaw State University Men's Basketball team on winning the 2004 NCAA Division II National Championship. This is a tremendous accomplishment and the players and coaching staff of the Kennesaw State University Men's Basketball team are to be commended.

I would like to congratulate Head Coach Tony Ingle. Under his leadership, the Owls of Kennesaw State have achieved new levels of success. Coach Ingle has been named the Division II Bulletin/Moulten Coach of the Year, the National Association of Basketball Coaches Coach of the Year, and the Naismith

Awards Georgia Co-Coach of the Year. These accolades are a testament to his knowledge and experience in the sport of basketball as well as his strength as a leader. Coach Ingle has been able to take a promising young program under his wing and guide it to new heights.

I would also like to recognize the individual Owl players for their hard work and tremendous dedication. It takes incredible endurance and grueling physical and mental trials to attain a national championship. The players of Kennesaw State have not only endured, but excelled and thereby achieved one of the highest honors in college athletics. Their dedication serves as an example of devotion, and their commitment and perseverance is to be commended here today.

As we recognize this achievement, we must not forget that while working toward these goals, these athletes are college students, equally committed to completing their studies and gaining an invaluable education at one of our great institutions of higher learning. I would also like to offer my congratulations to Kennesaw State University. A strong support network is required for athletes to achieve the level of success that these students have attained. Kennesaw State University has provided this network, which includes faculty, members of the administration and the student body, in support of the men's basketball team as they worked toward this national title.

Finally, I would like to ensure that the parents of these student athletes receive their very just accolades. The importance of a parent's role in the success of a child cannot be underestimated. Whether waking up early to shuttle children to and from practice or driving great distances to cheer their kids on from the stands, parents sacrifice much so that their kids can achieve more. Through ups, downs, success and defeat, a parent's support is often the bedrock on which a student athlete stands.

Again, I would like to congratulate the Kennesaw State University Men's Basketball Team on winning the 2004 Division II National Championship and wish them well in all of their future endeavors.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, having no further speakers, I encourage all Members to vote in favor of H. Res. 594, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 594.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1830

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

## REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4227, MIDDLE-CLASS ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX RELIEF ACT OF 2004

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108-477) on the resolution (H. Res. 619) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4227) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend to 2005 the alternative minimum tax relief available in 2003 and 2004 and to index such relief for inflation, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

House Resolution 600, by the yeas and nays;

House Concurrent Resolution 380, by the yeas and nays; and

House Resolution 599, by the yeas and nays.

The first and third electronic votes will be conducted as 15-minute votes. The second vote in this series will be a 5-minute vote.

## CONGRATULATING CHARTER SCHOOLS FOR THEIR ONGOING CONTRIBUTIONS TO EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 600, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 600, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 396, nays 0, answered "present" 3, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 139]

YEAS—396

Abercrombie  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Allen  
Andrews  
Baca  
Bachus

Baird  
Baker  
Baldwin  
Ballance  
Ballenger  
Barrett (SC)  
Bartlett (MD)  
Barton (TX)  
Bass  
Beauprez  
Becerra  
Bereuter  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Biggert

Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Bishop (UT)  
Blackburn  
Blumenauer  
Blunt  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bonner  
Boozman  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Bradley (NH)  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Brown (OH)  
Brown (SC)  
Brown-Waite,  
Ginny  
Burgess  
Burns  
Calvert  
Camp  
Cannon  
Cantor  
Capito  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardin  
Cardoza  
Carson (OK)  
Carter  
Case  
Castle  
Chandler  
Chocola  
Clay  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Cole  
Collins  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costello  
Cox  
Cramer  
Crane  
Crenshaw  
Crowley  
Cubin  
Cummings  
Cunningham  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (FL)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (TN)  
Davis, Jo Ann  
Davis, Tom  
Deal (GA)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
DeLay  
Deutsch  
Diaz-Balart, L.  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Dooley (CA)  
Doolittle  
Doyle  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Ehlers  
Emanuel  
Emerson  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Evans  
Everett  
Farr  
Fattah  
Feeney  
Ferguson  
Filner  
Flake  
Foley  
Forbes  
Ford  
Fossella  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Frost

Galleghy  
Garrett (NJ)  
Gerlach  
Gibbons  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gingrey  
Gonzalez  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Gordon  
Goss  
Granger  
Graves  
Green (TX)  
Green (WI)  
Greenwood  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Gutknecht  
Hall  
Harman  
Harris  
Hart  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Hill  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hobson  
Hoeffel  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hooley (OR)  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hoyer  
Hunter  
Hyde  
Inlee  
Isakson  
Israel  
Issa  
Istook  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
Jenkins  
John  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones (NC)  
Jones (OH)  
Kaptur  
Keller  
Kelly  
Kennedy (MN)  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kirk  
Kleczka  
Kline  
Kolbe  
LaHood  
Lampson  
Langevin  
Lantos  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Leach  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Lofgren  
Lowey  
Lucas (KY)  
Lucas (OK)

Lynch  
Majette  
Maloney  
Manzullo  
Markley  
Marshall  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (MO)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McCotter  
McCrery  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHugh  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Menendez  
Mica  
Michaud  
Millender-  
McDonald  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Mollohan  
Moore  
Moran (KS)  
Moran (VA)  
Murphy  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Neugebauer  
Ney  
Northup  
Norwood  
Nunes  
Nussle  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Osborne  
Ose  
Otter  
Owens  
Oxley  
Pallone  
Pascarelli  
Pastor  
Paul  
Payne  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Pence  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Putnam  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Renzi  
Reyes  
Rodriguez  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Ryan (WI)  
Ryun (KS)  
Sabo

Sánchez, Linda T.  
 Sanchez, Loretta  
 Sanders  
 Sandlin  
 Saxton  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Schrock  
 Scott (GA)  
 Scott (VA)  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Serrano  
 Sessions  
 Shadegg  
 Shaw  
 Shays  
 Sherman  
 Sherwood  
 Shimkus  
 Shuster  
 Simmons  
 Simpson  
 Skelton  
 Smith (MI)  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (TX)

Smith (WA)  
 Snyder  
 Souder  
 Spratt  
 Stark  
 Stearns  
 Stenholm  
 Stupak  
 Sullivan  
 Sweeney  
 Tancred  
 Tauscher  
 Taylor (MS)  
 Taylor (NC)  
 Terry  
 Thomas  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Thornberry  
 Tiahrt  
 Tiberi  
 Towns  
 Turner (TX)  
 Udall (CO)  
 Udall (NM)  
 Upton

Van Hollen  
 Velázquez  
 Vitter  
 Walden (OR)  
 Walsh  
 Wamp  
 Waters  
 Watson  
 Watt  
 Waxman  
 Weiner  
 Weldon (FL)  
 Weldon (PA)  
 Weller  
 Wexler  
 Whitfield  
 Wicker  
 Wilson (NM)  
 Wilson (SC)  
 Wolf  
 Woolsey  
 Wu  
 Wynn  
 Young (AK)  
 Young (FL)

[Roll No. 140]

## YEAS—402

Abercrombie  
 Ackerman  
 Aderholt  
 Akin  
 Alexander  
 Allen  
 Andrews  
 Baca  
 Bachus  
 Baird  
 Baker  
 Baldwin  
 Ballance  
 Ballenger  
 Barrett (SC)  
 Bartlett (MD)  
 Barton (TX)  
 Bass  
 Beauprez  
 Becerra  
 Bell  
 Bereuter  
 Berkley  
 Berman  
 Berry  
 Biggert  
 Bilirakis  
 Bishop (GA)  
 Bishop (NY)  
 Bishop (UT)  
 Blackburn  
 Blumenauer  
 Blunt  
 Boehlert  
 Boehner  
 Bonilla  
 Bonner  
 Boozman  
 Boswell  
 Boucher  
 Bradley (NH)  
 Brady (PA)  
 Brady (TX)  
 Brown (OH)  
 Brown (SC)  
 Brown-Waite,  
 Ginny  
 Burgess  
 Burns  
 Calvert  
 Camp  
 Cantor  
 Capito  
 Capps  
 Capuano  
 Cardin  
 Cardoza  
 Carson (OK)  
 Carter  
 Case  
 Castle  
 Chandler  
 Chocola  
 Clay  
 Clyburn  
 Coble  
 Cole  
 Collins  
 Conyers  
 Cooper  
 Costello  
 Cox  
 Cramer  
 Crane  
 Crenshaw  
 Crowley  
 Cubin  
 Cummings  
 Cunningham  
 Davis (AL)  
 Davis (CA)  
 Davis (FL)  
 Davis (IL)  
 Davis (TN)  
 Davis, Jo Ann  
 Davis, Tom  
 Deal (GA)  
 DeFazio  
 DeGette  
 DeLauro  
 DeLay  
 Deutsch  
 Diaz-Balart, L.  
 Diaz-Balart, M.  
 Dicks  
 Dingell

Dooley (CA)  
 Doolittle  
 Doyle  
 Dreier  
 Duncan  
 Dunn  
 Edwards  
 Ehlers  
 Emanuel  
 Emerson  
 Engel  
 Eshoo  
 Etheridge  
 Evans  
 Everett  
 Farr  
 Fattah  
 Feeney  
 Ferguson  
 Filner  
 Flake  
 Foley  
 Forbes  
 Ford  
 Fossella  
 Frank (MA)  
 Franks (AZ)  
 Frelinghuysen  
 Frost  
 Gallegly  
 Garrett (NJ)  
 Gerlach  
 Gibbons  
 Gilchrest  
 Gillmor  
 Gingrey  
 Gonzalez  
 Goode  
 Goodlatte  
 Gordon  
 Goss  
 Granger  
 Graves  
 Green (TX)  
 Green (WI)  
 Greenwood  
 Grijalva  
 Gutierrez  
 Gutknecht  
 Hall  
 Harman  
 Harris  
 Hart  
 Hastings (FL)  
 Hastings (WA)  
 Hayes  
 Hayworth  
 Hefley  
 Hensarling  
 Herger  
 Hill  
 Hinchey  
 Hinojosa  
 Hobson  
 Hoeffel  
 Hoekstra  
 Holden  
 Holt  
 Honda  
 Hooley (OR)  
 Hostettler  
 Houghton  
 Hoyer  
 Hunter  
 Hyde  
 Inslee  
 Isakson  
 Israel  
 Issa  
 Istook  
 Jackson (IL)  
 Jackson-Lee  
 (TX)  
 Jefferson  
 Jenkins  
 John  
 Johnson (CT)  
 Johnson (IL)  
 Johnson, E. B.  
 Johnson, Sam  
 Jones (NC)  
 Jones (OH)  
 Kaptur  
 Keller  
 Kelly  
 Kennedy (MN)

Pelosi  
 Pence  
 Peterson (MN)  
 Peterson (PA)  
 Petri  
 Pickering  
 Pitts  
 Platts  
 Pombo  
 Pomeroy  
 Porter  
 Price (NC)  
 Pryce (OH)  
 Putnam  
 Quinn  
 Radanovich  
 Rahall  
 Ramstad  
 Rangel  
 Regula  
 Rehberg  
 Renzi  
 Reyes  
 Rodriguez  
 Rogers (AL)  
 Rogers (KY)  
 Rogers (MI)  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Ross  
 Rothman  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Royce  
 Ruppertsberger  
 Rush  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Ryan (WI)  
 Ryun (KS)  
 Sabo  
 Sánchez, Linda T.

Sánchez, Loretta  
 Sanders  
 Sandlin  
 Saxton  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Schrock  
 Scott (GA)  
 Scott (VA)  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Serrano  
 Sessions  
 Shadegg  
 Shaw  
 Shays  
 Sherman  
 Sherwood  
 Shimkus  
 Shuster  
 Simmons  
 Simpson  
 Skelton  
 Slaughter  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Smith (WA)  
 Snyder  
 Souder  
 Spratt  
 Stark  
 Stearns  
 Stenholm  
 Strickland  
 Stupak  
 Sweeney  
 Tancred  
 Tanner  
 Tauscher  
 Taylor (MS)  
 Taylor (NC)

Terry  
 Thomas  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Thornberry  
 Tiahrt  
 Tiberi  
 Tierney  
 Toomey  
 Towns  
 Turner (TX)  
 Udall (CO)  
 Udall (NM)  
 Upton  
 Van Hollen  
 Velázquez  
 Vitter  
 Walden (OR)  
 Walsh  
 Wamp  
 Waters  
 Watson  
 Watt  
 Waxman  
 Weiner  
 Weldon (FL)  
 Weldon (PA)  
 Weller  
 Wexler  
 Whitfield  
 Wicker  
 Wilson (NM)  
 Wilson (SC)  
 Wolf  
 Woolsey  
 Wu  
 Wynn  
 Young (FL)

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Ackerman Strickland Tierney

## NOT VOTING—34

Bell  
 Bono  
 Boyd  
 Brown, Corrine  
 Burr  
 Burton (IN)  
 Buyer  
 Carson (IN)  
 Chabot  
 Culberson  
 Delahunt  
 DeMint

Doggett  
 Edwards  
 English  
 Gephardt  
 Hulshof  
 Kanjorski  
 Knollenberg  
 Kucinich  
 McInnis  
 Murtha  
 Musgrave  
 Nethercutt

Platts  
 Portman  
 Reynolds  
 Rohrabacher  
 Solis  
 Tauzin  
 Toomey  
 Turner (OH)  
 Visclosky

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT) (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1855

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 139 on H. Res. 600 congratulating charter schools, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

## RECOGNIZING BENEFITS AND IMPORTANCE OF SCHOOL-BASED MUSIC EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 380, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 380, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 0, not voting 31, as follows:

## NOT VOTING—31

Bono  
 Boyd  
 Brown, Corrine  
 Burr  
 Burton (IN)  
 Buyer  
 Cannon  
 Carson (IN)  
 Chabot  
 Culberson  
 Delahunt

DeMint  
 Doggett  
 English  
 Gephardt  
 Hulshof  
 Kanjorski  
 Kucinich  
 McInnis  
 Murtha  
 Nethercutt  
 Portman

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are reminded that there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1904

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 140 on H. Res. 380, recognizing the importance of music education, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

## CONGRATULATING UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT HUSKIES FOR WINNING 2004 NCAA DIVISION I MEN AND WOMEN'S BASKETBALL CHAMPIONSHIPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 599.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SIMMONS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 599, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 401, nays 0, answered “present” 2, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 141]		
YEAS—401		
Abercrombie	Davis, Tom	Inslee
Ackerman	Deal (GA)	Isakson
Aderholt	DeFazio	Israel
Akin	DeGette	Issa
Alexander	DeLauro	Istook
Allen	DeLay	Jackson (IL)
Andrews	Deutsch	Jackson-Lee
Baca	Diaz-Balart, L.	(TX)
Bachus	Diaz-Balart, M.	Jefferson
Baird	Dicks	Jenkins
Baker	Dingell	John
Baldwin	Dooley (CA)	Johnson (CT)
Ballance	Doollittle	Johnson (IL)
Ballenger	Doyle	Johnson, E. B.
Barrett (SC)	Dreier	Johnson, Sam
Bartlett (MD)	Duncan	Jones (NC)
Barton (TX)	Dunn	Jones (OH)
Bass	Edwards	Kaptur
Beauprez	Ehlers	Keller
Becerra	Emanuel	Kelly
Bell	Emerson	Kennedy (MN)
Bereuter	Engel	Kennedy (RI)
Berkley	Eshoo	Kildee
Berry	Etheridge	Kilpatrick
Biggart	Evans	Kind
Bilirakis	Everett	King (IA)
Bishop (GA)	Farr	King (NY)
Bishop (NY)	Fattah	Kingston
Blackburn	Feeney	Kirk
Blumenauer	Ferguson	Klecza
Blunt	Filner	Kline
Boehlert	Flake	Knollenberg
Boehner	Foley	Kolbe
Bonilla	Forbes	LaHood
Bonner	Ford	Lampson
Boozman	Fossella	Langevin
Boswell	Frank (MA)	Lantos
Boucher	Franks (AZ)	Larsen (WA)
Bradley (NH)	Frelinghuysen	Larson (CT)
Brady (PA)	Frost	Latham
Brady (TX)	Gallegly	LaTourette
Brown (OH)	Garrett (NJ)	Leach
Brown (SC)	Gerlach	Lee
Brown-Waite,	Gibbons	Levin
Ginny	Gilchrest	Lewis (CA)
Burgess	Gillmor	Lewis (GA)
Burns	Gonzalez	Lewis (KY)
Calvert	Goode	Linder
Camp	Goodlatte	Lipinski
Cannon	Gordon	LoBiondo
Cantor	Goss	Lofgren
Capito	Granger	Lowe
Capps	Graves	Lucas (KY)
Capuano	Green (TX)	Lucas (OK)
Cardin	Green (WI)	Lynch
Cardoza	Greenwood	Majette
Carson (OK)	Grijalva	Maloney
Carter	Gutierrez	Manzullo
Case	Gutknecht	Markey
Castle	Hall	Marshall
Chandler	Harman	Matheson
Chocola	Harris	Matsui
Clay	Hart	McCarthy (MO)
Clyburn	Hastings (FL)	McCarthy (NY)
Coble	Hastings (WA)	McCollum
Cole	Hayworth	McCotter
Collins	Hefley	McCrery
Conyers	Hensarling	McDermott
Cooper	Herger	McGovern
Costello	Hill	McHugh
Cox	Hinchey	McIntyre
Cramer	Hinojosa	McKeon
Crane	Hobson	McNulty
Crenshaw	Hoeffel	Meehan
Crowley	Hoekstra	Meek (FL)
Cubin	Holden	Meeks (NY)
Cummings	Holt	Menendez
Cunningham	Honda	Mica
Davis (AL)	Hooley (OR)	Michaud
Davis (CA)	Hostettler	Millender-
Davis (FL)	Houghton	McDonald
Davis (IL)	Hoyer	Miller (FL)
Davis (TN)	Hunter	Miller (MI)
Davis, Jo Ann	Hyde	Miller (NC)

Miller, Gary	Regula	Stark
Miller, George	Rehberg	Stearns
Mollohan	Renzi	Stenholm
Moore	Reyes	Strickland
Moran (KS)	Rodriguez	Stupak
Moran (VA)	Rogers (AL)	Sullivan
Murphy	Rogers (KY)	Sweeney
Musgrave	Rogers (MI)	Tancredo
Myrick	Ros-Lehtinen	Tanner
Nadler	Ross	Tauscher
Napolitano	Rothman	Taylor (MS)
Neal (MA)	Roybal-Allard	Taylor (NC)
Neugebauer	Royce	Terry
Ney	Ruppersberger	Thomas
Northup	Rush	Thompson (CA)
Norwood	Ryan (OH)	Thompson (MS)
Nunes	Ryan (WI)	Thornberry
Nussle	Ryun (KS)	Tiahrt
Oberstar	Sabo	Tiberi
Obey	Sánchez, Linda	Tierney
Oliver	T.	Toomey
Ortiz	Sanchez, Loretta	Towns
Osborne	Sanders	Turner (TX)
Ose	Sandlin	Udall (CO)
Otter	Saxton	Udall (NM)
Owens	Schakowsky	Upton
Oxley	Schiff	Van Hollen
Pallone	Schrock	Velázquez
Pascarell	Scott (GA)	Vitter
Pastor	Scott (VA)	Walden (OR)
Paul	Sensenbrenner	Walsh
Payne	Serrano	Wamp
Pearce	Sessions	Waters
Pelosi	Shadegg	Watson
Pence	Shaw	Watt
Peterson (MN)	Shays	Waxman
Peterson (PA)	Sherman	Weiner
Petri	Sherwood	Weldon (FL)
Pickering	Shimkus	Weldon (PA)
Pitts	Shuster	Weller
Platts	Simmons	Wexler
Pombo	Simpson	Whitfield
Pomeroy	Skelton	Wicker
Porter	Slaughter	Wilson (NM)
Price (NC)	Smith (MI)	Wilson (SC)
Pryce (OH)	Smith (NJ)	Wolf
Putnam	Smith (TX)	Woolsey
Quinn	Smith (WA)	Wu
Radanovich	Snyder	Wynn
Rahall	Souder	Young (AK)
Ramstad	Spratt	Young (FL)

#### ANSWERED “PRESENT”—2

Gingrey

Hayes

#### NOT VOTING—30

Berman	Culberson	Murtha
Bishop (UT)	Delahunt	Nethercutt
Bono	DeMint	Portman
Boyd	Doggett	Rangel
Brown, Corrine	English	Reynolds
Burr	Gephardt	Rohrabacher
Burton (IN)	Hulshof	Solis
Buyer	Kanjorski	Tauzin
Carson (IN)	Kucinich	Turner (OH)
Chabot	McInnis	Visclosky

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT) (during the vote). Members are reminded there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1920

Mr. KING of Iowa changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 141 on H. Res. 599, congratulating the University of Connecticut Huskies, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, as today is primary election day in Indiana, I

was delayed in my return to Washington, DC, and therefore unable to be on the House floor for rollcall votes 139, 140, and 141. Had I been here I would have voted “yea” for rollcall vote 139, “yea” for rollcall vote 140, and “yea” for rollcall vote 141.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DeMINT. Madam Speaker, I was absent during rollcall votes 139, 140, and 141. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on each of the votes.

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 898

Mrs. MYRICK. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 898, the Lumbee Recognition Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON S. CON. RES. 95, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005

Mr. MOORE. Madam Speaker, subject to rule XXII, clause 7(c), I hereby announce my intention to offer a motion to instruct on S. Con. Res. 95, Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2005.

The form of the motion is as follows:

I move that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 95 be instructed to agree to the pay-as-you-go enforcement provisions within the scope of the conference regarding direct spending increases and tax cuts in the House and Senate. In complying with this instruction, such managers shall be instructed to recede to the Senate on the provisions contained in section 408 of the Senate concurrent resolution (relating to the pay-as-you-go point of order regarding all legislation increasing the deficit as a result of direct spending increases and tax cuts).

#### BIDDING FAREWELL TO “MORNING EDITION’S” BOB EDWARDS

(Mr. BLUMENAUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, Friday marked the farewell to “Morning Edition’s” Bob Edwards. PBS’s “Morning Edition” has become the signature program for public radio across America, giving expression to things about which Americans care the most: war and peace, arts and culture, athletics, the dramas large and small that shape our everyday lives, and the global events that profoundly affect the way Americans look at themselves and others.

For 24½ years, Bob Edwards has been the voice of “Morning Edition.” Two

generations have grown up with him, four have been profoundly influenced. His has been a voice of civility, reason, thoughtful exchange, and good humor, exactly why most of us are not just devoted fans of public broadcasting, but heavily dependent upon it.

Thank you, Bob Edwards, for almost a quarter century of enriching our lives. The last show was poignant and insightful, everything we have come to expect from you. With profound sadness and regret at your departure, we have great expectations about what you will do next.

Best wishes, Bob Edwards.

#### PRESIDENT EXPLAINING AWAY TERRIBLE ECONOMIC RECORD IN OHIO

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, President Bush came to Ohio today on about his 20th trip to campaign for reelection in our State, and the reason he comes back so often in Ohio is to try to explain away his terrible economic record.

Since George Bush became President, Ohio has lost one-sixth of its manufacturing jobs; 177,000 manufacturing jobs alone have left the State. Every single month of the Bush administration, we have lost manufacturing jobs.

The President's answer? More tax cuts for the most privileged people. If you make \$1 million, you get a \$123,000 tax cut, hoping that will trickle down and create jobs. It is not working. His other solution is more NAFTA-like trade agreements that hemorrhage jobs, that send jobs overseas.

We need to change the direction of this economy, to change the direction of this country. Workers should get their unemployment compensation extended. We should be giving breaks to those companies that manufacture in the United States, not ship jobs overseas.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

#### MAKING THE BAN ON ASSAULT WEAPONS PERMANENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, this Sunday is Mother's Day; and while many of our colleagues will be spending time with their families and their wives, thousands of women will be coming down here to Wash-

ington again to have their voices heard. We are going to have an Assault on Washington to make sure the assault weapons ban stays in place. We only have until September 13 to make sure a vote comes up on this floor.

As you can see by the poster, when our children go back to school, when your kids go back to school, will assault weapons be going back too?

Mr. Speaker, on Sunday of last week, I went to a memorial service for our police officers that have died in the line of duty, and they were put on the Wall. Many of those police officers came up to me and they said, What is going on in Washington? Why in heaven's name would anyone down there want to have assault weapons back on the streets?

Well, the million moms, the grandmothers, their husbands, grandfathers will be here on Sunday. Our voices will be heard once again. But this is only going to be the kickoff; because from Sunday on, throughout the United States we are going to be touring the country and raising our voices and awareness. The American people have to realize, come September 13, assault weapons, Uzis, AK-47s, Bushmasters will be back on the street.

Do we want to go back there? Do we want to go back to the time when these guns were gunning down children in our communities, gunning down our police officers? Does anybody remember why we banned the assault weapons in the first place? Because too many people were dying.

The American people do not want assault weapons back on their streets. They can do something about that. Call the Speaker of the House. Call the President, who has promised to sign the bill if it gets on his desk. That is an empty promise. If we cannot have a vote here in the House to make sure the assault weapons ban is renewed and made permanent, they will be back on our streets. Even gun owners across this Nation agree that assault weapons should not be on the streets.

Mr. Speaker, we have to do an awful lot of work between here and the end of this session, but I am saying to my colleagues that we must all come together to make sure the assault weapons ban stays in place. We have to do this. It is common sense. It is not taking away the right of anyone to own a gun.

I know there are people out there that feel they should have an assault weapon. Well, unfortunately, when we see gangs in our communities growing every day, when we see drug lords coming into our communities every day, when they talk about having terrorists in our communities waiting who can go to a gun show or go into your local gun store now and buy assault weapons, is that what we wanted?

When I first got involved in this issue, it was for personal reasons. Many of the people that will be here on Sunday are victims. Many have lost their children, many have lost their husbands, many have lost their wives.

This is something the American people can do, but we must hear from you.

Again, the American people on a grassroots level can make a difference. There are so many nurses out there, teachers out there, doctors out there that are behind us on making sure it gets through. But you cannot just say you want this. You have to call.

□ 1930

You have to call your Representative. You have to call your Senators. You have to make sure that they hear from you.

With this election season coming up, this should be an issue. We can save lives. We can save an awful lot of lives. Why should we go forward and let these assault weapons back on our streets, and then, all of a sudden, a tragedy happens in our school yard or on a train, or anywhere in this country? And again, the panic that comes here. We have to do something; we have to do something.

This is a bill that has worked. This is a bill that does work. I happen to think we should make it stronger by making it permanent. I happen to think the gun manufacturers should be held accountable for making copycats. But the main issue should be assault weapons of any kind should not come back onto our streets. This is something that we can do. I need your help. I need the American people's help. Come out on Sunday. Come out and support the assault on assault weapons bans. Protect our children.

#### ALCOHOL AWARENESS MONTH AND H. RES. 575

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, this evening we honored the Connecticut men's and women's basketball teams for winning national championships, a truly remarkable accomplishment to have two teams from one school do this. Not long ago, the National Academy of Science released a report on preventing underage drinking. This seems like disparate events, but they are actually connected.

The National Academy of Science report recommended that colleges and universities ban alcohol advertising and promotion on campus in order to discourage alcohol use among underage students.

Research points out the problem of alcohol consumption on college campuses. First of all, 1,400 college students are killed annually in alcohol-related accidents, and we have all anguished over the fatalities in Iraq, over 700. Well, more than double that number will be killed on college campuses this year because of alcohol abuse.

The proportion of college students who say they drink to get drunk is rising. In 1993, roughly 40 percent of college students reported binge drinking.

By 2001, that figure had risen to 48 percent. Mr. Speaker, 70,000 students are victims of alcohol-related sexual assaults each year. Most of these are date rapes. More than 500,000 students suffer alcohol-related injuries annually.

Despite these statistics, a total of \$53 million in 2001 and \$58 million in 2002 was spent to place ads in college sports programs by the alcohol industry.

The 2002 NCAA basketball tournament had more alcohol ads than the Super Bowl, the World Series, college bowl games, and Monday Night Football combined. Alcohol advertising made up more than twice the percentage of ad spending on college sports of all other television programs in 2001 and 2002. Recent riots at the University of Connecticut and Iowa State, as well as some of the recruiting scandals we have heard about on college campuses, have been fueled largely by alcohol.

A spokesperson from the NCAA recently said, "Alcohol advertising is not inconsistent with our mission." I beg to differ. The NCAA handbook states that NCAA policy should exclude "advertisements that do not seem to be in the best interests of higher education."

As a result of the mixed messages our colleges and universities are sending, I have introduced House Resolution 575 calling upon NCAA member schools to voluntarily ban advertising on college sports broadcasts. This is simply a resolution. It is something I hope that Members of Congress will get behind because we think we need to call attention to the inconsistency of policies that our colleges and universities are promoting.

Dean Smith, the former North Carolina basketball coach who set all kinds of coaching records said this. He said, "If aspirin were the leading cause of death on college campuses, do you think chancellors, presidents, and trustees would allow aspirin commercials on basketball commercials on telecasts. They wouldn't, not for a minute."

I recently speak to Coach John Wooden, who won 10 NCAA basketball championships in 12 years; and he wholeheartedly endorses taking alcohol advertising out of college sports. So I would agree with Dean Smith and Don Wooden, because over 36 years on college campuses, I saw case after case where alcohol was the biggest problem that we encountered.

Apparently others agree: 84 percent of Americans think advertising beer on college games is not in the best interests of higher education; 71 percent of Americans support a ban of alcohol ads on college games; 77 percent of parents say it is wrong for colleges to profit from alcohol advertising while trying to combat alcohol abuse on their campuses.

The problem outlined by the National Academy of Science study goes beyond the college campus. I think this is certainly worthy of note, Mr. Speaker. Underage drinking is a serious issue in our middle schools, in our high

schools and, in some cases, in our elementary schools. We have over 3 million teenage alcoholics in our country today. By the end of the eighth grade, 47 percent of students have engaged in heavy drinking. Most eighth graders are 13 years old. Children who drink before age 15 are four times more likely to become alcohol-dependent than those who wait until after 15. Underage drinking kills 6.5 times more youth than all other illegal drugs combined; and yet this problem flies largely under the radar screen. Underage drinking costs the American taxpayers each year more than \$50 billion. Despite these numbers, the Federal Government spends 25 times more on combating drugs such as cocaine, marijuana, and heroin than on preventing underage alcohol use.

I urge my colleagues to pay attention to this serious problem, as we are going to shortly introduce some legislation to combat this particular issue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my Special Order out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

#### IMPORTATION, DISCOUNT CARDS, AND MEDICARE MISINFORMATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to review this week as it relates to the Medicare prescription drug bill.

It started with the Secretary of Health and Human Services announcing on Monday, given the confusion over the Web site that they had put up, that they were going to think about taking it down because there was such confusion out among seniors about the pricing and among the pharmaceutical companies about actually what, in fact, they were offering and whether there was a discount. The Web site was intended, as Tommy Thompson said, to drive prices down.

There was such confusion in the marketplace that on the first day, Health and Human Services Secretary Tommy Thompson said we are thinking of taking the Web site down. Then they launched the big discount card that is supposed to provide somewhere between a 10 to 20 percent discount on prices.

Every year for the last 6 years, prices of prescription drugs have gone up, on

average, 17 percent, somewhere around five times the rate of inflation; and this year it is projected to go up 18 percent, and next year it is projected to go up 20 percent. The card was so confusing that at the Speaker's own town hall meeting, he got into an argument with a senior citizen who said, why do we not just do what Canada does and offer and, in fact, allow us to buy drugs in Canada where they are 30 to 80 percent cheaper? In fact, if you compare the discount that the drug card would offer like on Lipitor versus what the price is in Canada or Europe, even with the discount card, the prices for Lipitor in Europe are 129 percent cheaper than they are even with the discount card. Celebrex, another common drug, even with the discount price from the card, in Europe and in Canada, the price is 85 percent cheaper. Seniors know that.

Third, just this week, the Congressional Research Service found that, in fact, the cost of the bill for prescription drugs was never \$400 billion, but \$534 billion, and that the administrator, Mr. Foster, who intended to tell Congress, was told he was not allowed to and withheld the information from Congress; that in fact the Members who told him that have broken the law; broken the law.

I will tell my colleagues today, if that bill was on the floor, it would go down in resounding defeat, because people in Congress who thought they were getting all of the protection from the pharmaceutical industry have realized finally, having talked to their constituents, what is wrong with this bill. It does nothing to affect price. So we can have all the discount cards we want, we can have a Web site that is a failure, and now we have information out there that, in fact, people broke the law trying to pass this bill, and we now know what seniors have always told us. Since the bill did nothing to affect price, nothing to affect affordability, nothing to give them world-class drugs at world-class prices, which is the cheapest prices we could get, that in fact Congress was deceived and not given the information that was required to deal with that legislation.

Just today, at 5:30 in the evening, Secretary Tommy Thompson, having fought tooth and nail to oppose the notion of allowing people to buy drugs in Canada and in Europe and to bring competition to the market and bring choice to the market, at 5:30 this evening Tommy Thompson announced that he believes in the reimportation of prescription drugs, that we should pass legislation, and he would recommend that the President sign that legislation. So in the last 48 hours, I just want my colleagues to review this with me.

The Congressional Research Service has found out that members of the administration broke the law by withholding information from Congress. The Web site that they put up to help bring competition to the market, they



are going to bring the Web site down because it is confusing and they have the wrong prices up there. The discount card is so confusing that on a report on NPR this morning, if you listened to the official trying to listen to the senior citizen, the official said, "A mail order's around a 90-day. That's a 3-month supply." Senior: "Oh, okay." Official: "So to compare the prices, multiply." The senior: "Multiply the 3?" The official: "The 30-day by 3 to get your 90 days, yup. And not all of them have mail orders, so." Senior: "Mm-humm." The official: "And then this will tell how many pharmacies are in your area. How far would you like to go from our ZIP code to look for a pharmacy? You want to keep it within a mile?" The senior starts laughing. The official: "We do have other choices, there's a range here."

This, to a senior citizen who is looking for a lifesaving drug on arthritis, heart, blood pressure, bone strengthening. They are supposed to sit there and try to figure this out. Rather than giving them a benefit and rather than trying to organize and bring prices down in the market, we drive them crazy.

So to top it off, Tommy Thompson now has come around to the view that in fact what we need and to deal with this is what all of us know who dared talk to any of our constituents, that we have got to deal with price. That is the only way to affect and help our senior citizens and our taxpayers, who now are going to be asked not to pay \$400 billion, but \$535 billion for a bill that if it was brought forward today would go down in resounding defeat.

I welcome Tommy Thompson's open mind and bipartisanship to come to realize what all of us knew in this Congress, that we need reimportation to bring down the prices of prescription drugs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### NO APOLOGY REQUIRED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, last week, several Members of this body issued statements criticizing Presidential adviser Karen Hughes, demanding an apology for comments she made on April 25, 2004. Unfortunately, my colleagues have distorted her remarks into a misrepresentation of her actual sentiment, which I fully support.

In a live interview on CNN on April 25, Ms. Hughes is quoted as saying, "I think after September 11 the American

people are valuing life more and realizing that we need policies to value the dignity and worth of every life.

"And President Bush has worked to say, let's be reasonable, let's work to value life, let's try to reduce the number of abortions, let's increase adoptions."

She goes on to say, "Unfortunately our enemies in the terror network, as we're seeing repeatedly in the headlines these days, don't value any life, not even the innocent and not even their own." That was on CNN "Late Edition," April 25, 2004.

In response to her words, some of my colleagues have accused Hughes of equating those who support abortion with terrorists. They have requested an apology for this alleged use of "cheap and distasteful politics." I find this gross misrepresentation of Ms. Hughes' comments disgusting and firmly stand behind her words.

Mr. Speaker, this demand for an apology is simply a political ploy designed to damage the pro-life movement and to promote the abortion industry and their pursuit of increased abortions. Abortion is a money-making business, and the pro-abortion movement will take any chance they can to derail those who promote life.

Planned Parenthood's budget for fiscal year ending June of 2002 showed total revenue of \$692.5 million, and they had a profit of \$12.2 million for that 1-year period alone.

Personally, I would like to thank Karen Hughes for her words because she was right; and, no, I will not apologize.

□ 1945

Although Mrs. Hughes did not insinuate that these groups were terrorists, I find it amazing that these pro-abortion groups, like Planned Parenthood, have the gall to claim that they are "offended" at this accusation.

Offended? Let me read to you some of the signs that were displayed at the pro-abortion rally in DC a few weeks ago. These were signs that did not make it to the mainstream newspaper. From World Magazine, May 8 edition, their signs read, "Abort Bush. We are pro-choice and we riot. Keep Bush's hands out of my pants."

Offended? I am personally offended as every American should be. And these groups claim to speak for all women. It is these very same groups that have repeatedly called pro-life groups like Concerned Women for American "terrorists." Yes, Planned Parenthood likes to use the word "terrorist" any time they deem it politically useful.

Recently, I saw on Planned Parenthood Federation's Web site a page entitled "Eye on Extremism," and under the heading titled "Terrorists and Extremist Organizations" was a detailed listing of 14 leading pro-life organizations.

I am familiar with the majority over these groups and it is clear that Planned Parenthood is simply working on a smear campaign.

So I have a question for Planned Parenthood: How can such a claim be made against Hughes, an unsubstantiated claim I might add, when groups advocating family and pro-life policies are branded as extremists and terrorists? Planned Parenthood, are you going to apologize for these groups for, as you put it, "cheap and distasteful politics."

A national Right to Life poll has indicated growing opposition to abortion; 56 percent of women, 62 percent of African Americans, 79 percent of Hispanics, 61 percent of 18 to 29 year olds reject abortion in most circumstances. Americans recognize the value of life.

As Mrs. Hughes stated, in the post-9-11 world, we as Americans have placed a greater emphasis on the value of life. We grieve for the loss of every soldier in Iraq and Afghanistan, cling tighter to our close friends and family, and are more conscientious of our personal and national security. Additionally, we celebrate the birth of every baby and adoption of every child into a loving family because we value each life.

Mrs. Hughes' comments in the April 25th interview were right on target.

The demand for an apology is absurd, and I would like to know if Planned Parenthood is going to apologize to the groups that they list as terrorists on their Web site. I doubt it, because each child saved from an abortion is money that the abortion industry will not get. And that, unfortunately, is what this is all about.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

#### PRESIDENTIAL MISTAKES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, last month, not too long ago, the President was asked in a news conference, only his third news conference in prime time since he took office, What would your biggest mistake be after 9-11 and what lessons have you learned from it?

President Bush said, "I'm sure something will pop in to my mind here in the midst of this press conference, with all pressure of trying to come up with an answer but it hasn't yet."

Then on May 1, earlier this week, the President, joking about it, said, "I was going to start off tonight telling some self-deprecating jokes." And the Republican crowd laughed. And then he said, "But then I couldn't think of any mistakes that I had made to be self-deprecating about."

Now, it is hard to believe that anyone in my State of Ohio who has lost his or her job, 177,000 manufacturing workers in Ohio have lost their jobs since President Bush took office, it is hard to think that any one of them thought that was very funny, that the President could not think of any mistakes that he made; mistakes that he could learn from, that he could correct and do something about.

It is hard to think that any veterans who have seen their benefits cut under this President think this was very funny. It is hard to think that those soldiers who do not have body armor in Iraq because the President and the Pentagon did not plan for it, that they think that is very funny, to say that he could not think of any mistakes. I do not think that too many Americans of the 43 million without health care think that is very funny that the President mentioned he could not think of any mistakes that he had made.

Now, there are a group of us coming to the floor tonight. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT), the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCARELL), the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) and the gentleman from California (Ms. LEE), that are going to talk about some of the mistakes, not to embarrass the President, in some sense not even to criticize the President, but just we hope to point some mistakes out tonight that the President has made so that he can correct them. Because we are all taught as children to learn from our mistakes.

If the President is unwilling to admit a mistake, if the President is unwilling to acknowledge that he even made any, and then if the President is willing to sit around and joke that he has not made any mistakes when we have lost this number of jobs in my State of Ohio and across the country, when our soldiers in Iraq are in harm's way because we have not provided body armor, because we are not providing the armor underneath the Humvees and on the doors of the Humvees to protect American troops, it is not really not much of a laughing matter.

Today the President was in Ohio and, again, the President continued the let us just kind of joke about this.

AP reports, "With humor and sarcasm, President Bush is trying to make JOHN KERRY eat his own words. At every stop of his Midwest bus tour, the President is mocking Kerry to the delight of partisan audiences."

I understand this is a Presidential race. I understand that politicians need to attack each other and make fun of

each other and all of this, but in light of the fact that the President is unwilling to admit any of these mistakes he made, we, tonight, the five or six of us, would like to help him talk about, whether it is a mistakes he made with weapons of mass destruction or Medicare or veterans' benefits or the tax cuts, a millionaire gets \$123,000 in tax cuts; whether it is job loss, whether it is totally forsaking both small business and the manufacturing base in this country.

The entire six Democratic-member delegation of Ohio wrote the President a list of questions as he arrived in Dayton, Ohio today in his Ask the President Forum that he is beginning to hold around the country. He did the first one in Dayton today.

We had some questions for the President about the new Medicare bill because we recognize that the Medicare bill was a mistake. First of all, the President allowed the drug companies and the insurance companies to write the bill. He also allowed the drug companies, that are going to make \$150 billion additional profits from that bill. The insurance companies will get a \$46 billion direct subsidy from this bill. But no surprise there, the President has already received tens of millions of dollars from the drug and the insurance industry for his election.

In fact, the word in the street in Washington, my colleagues and I have all heard, is that the President will receive a total of \$100 million from the drug industry for his reelection. Of course, he is going to support the drug industry. But, frankly, we consider that a mistake, when you write a Medicare bill that helps the drug industry, it helps the insurance industry, and then maybe you get around to dropping a few dollars for seniors.

When they release this prescription drug discount card today, we asked the President a couple of questions. Is it true the Medicare law allows drug and insurance companies offering discount cards to change covered drugs and discounts weekly? Does this not mean that seniors may choose a card one week that will be worth little or nothing to them the next?

In other words, seniors sign up for one of these discount drug cards. If you sign up for one of the 50 or 60 or 70 cards, you are stuck with it the entire year, even though the drug discount card company can turn around and take your drug off the list, can raise the price, can cut your discount.

Mr. Speaker, the President also mentioned in this bill, this Medicare bill, there is also a prohibition on drug companies, on the government negotiating cheaper prices. We know we can get cheaper drugs in Canada, yet the President will not allow it. Something is wrong. I wish the President would acknowledge his mistake. Go back to the drawing board and write a drug bill for the seniors, not for the drug companies.

## MISTAKES OF THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me first thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) for organizing tonight's series of statements about the consequences of the Bush administration's tragic and terrible decisions.

Now, last month, the President stated that he could not really think of a single particular mistake that he had made in office, though he conceded that he must have made some. Even worse, the President was either unable or unwilling to say what lessons he had learned from the process.

Now, tonight some of us are here to talk about the administration's decisions because, quite frankly, "mistake" is far too soft a word. It almost makes it sound like an accident. We are also here to talk about the consequences and the lessons that the entire world is learning from this administration.

Now, in the newspapers and on television in the past week we have all seen the horrifying pictures of American soldiers torturing, tormenting and humiliating Iraqi prisoners. We all know that this does not characterize the tens of thousands of brave men and women serving in Iraq, but we do note that it endangers their lives.

These pictures are horrifying, both because of the callous disregard for human rights that they show by individual American soldiers but also for the far more fundamental failures at the highest levels of leadership, failures that began with an administration that led the Nation to war under false pretenses.

The pictures are also horrifying for their consequences. What will happen to the next American soldiers or civilian captured? If we, the world's most powerful military country and greatest democracy, will not abide by the Geneva Convention and international law, then who will?

What will happen to our already devastated international reputation?

The Washington Post today reports that the State Department's Intelligence and Research Department is deeply concerned about a cascade of international criticism that could seriously affect our broader foreign goals.

Leaked portions of a 53-page report by Major General Antonio Taguba completed in February conclude that there were numerous, numerous instances of "sadistic, blatant and wanton criminal abuses at Abu Ghraib" prison.

I hope that this is not just the tip of the iceberg.

Individuals involved have stated that they were encouraged by military intelligence to engage in this abuse. Now, as one who has a background in psychology and mental health, I worry for our young men and women in uniform who are being dehumanized, dehumanized by a war that allows them to cross this threshold.

Now, many of the men and women and teenagers held in this prison, actually, the infamous prison which was known as a torture center for Saddam Hussein, they were picked up in random sweeps and at highway checkpoints.

People were held for months on little or no evidence, with no charges, no change at appeal, and now, it seems, in addition to that potentially widespread injustice, they may have been abused or even tortured.

The Department of Defense is investigating these charges, but he oversights quite frankly must be broader and the questions that are asked must be more sweeping. Congress absolutely has to exercise its oversight authority through a full scale investigation, a Congressional investigation.

Part of this examination also has to look at private contractors, some of whom will be running these prisons and some of whom are allegedly involved in these terrible acts. Human Rights Watch and other organizations have widely asked about the role of private contractors who seem to be operating entirely outside the boundaries of authority in a complete legal vacuum. They are exempt from prosecution by Iraqi courts. They are beyond the military chain of command and its court-martial authority, and they are outside the range of the United States courts.

This is one more consequence of turning over so much power and so much money to private contractors. This is one more example of a foreign policy and a military policy gone wrong. The United States has turned this prison especially, Abu Ghraib into a house of horrors. That failure is a metaphor for a foreign policy that has gone absolutely and tragically wrong. Our Nation is perceived in many circles as waging war on Islam. The pictures in the world's newspapers will only compound and confirm that perception. Those photographs build on an image of a Nation that ignores the United Nations, when it chooses to, of course, and turns to it when it gets in trouble.

They add to a portrait of a country that preaches about human rights but fails to uphold them. The pictures are just one more piece of evidence that this administration led our Nation to war without really a plan for its aftermath. And that utter failure, as I said, "mistake" is far too soft a word.

This policy has contributed to more than 500 American deaths since, mind you, since President Bush landed on that aircraft carrier and stood underneath that banner proclaiming "Mission accomplished."

Exactly what mission have we accomplished? We have not found any weapons of mass destruction, but we have seriously damaged our international credibility. We have not established any semblance of stability or safety in Iraq, although the deadline for the supposed Iraqi takeover of authority is just a month away.

We have not promoted the cause of democracy in the Middle East or anywhere else, but we have undermined the rule of international law.

□ 2000

We have not built a strong network of friends and allies to advance our joint goals, but we have squandered the enormous goodwill that the world stretched out to us in 2001. Ultimately, we have not made the world or ourselves safer. The policies of the Bush administration have made the world a far more dangerous place.

Tomorrow, the State Department issues its annual report on U.S. efforts to support human rights and democracy across the globe. Just what is this report going to say about the Bush administration's failures in Iraq and its efforts to overthrow democracy in Haiti? Just what is this report going to say about the abuse of individuals and organizations?

#### ADEQUATE PROTECTION FOR OUR TROOPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate being recognized.

Mr. Speaker, as my friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), said earlier, in a press conference recently on the 13th, the President was asked if he could identify any mistakes he may have made, and he was unable to do so.

I can tell him a mistake that he and his administration has made. They sent our young soldiers into harm's way when the war in Iraq began without adequate body armor. That is the truth. They cannot escape that fact. There were soldiers who were placed in harm's way without having the protection of this basic equipment.

The war began in March. I have written Secretary Rumsfeld over the last year two letters asking him to explain to me and to the American people why our soldiers were placed in harm's way without this protection.

This body armor that I am talking about became available, I think, for the first time in 1998. It is called the "interceptive vest." It is made of Kevlar with ceramic plates in both the front and the back. It is so effective that it can stop an AK-47 bullet, and it has been credited with saving the lives of many of our soldiers who had them and could use them.

When we went into Iraq, after literally months during which we could have prepared to have had adequate equipment for our troops, we sent our soldiers into battle without this protection; and Mr. Speaker, it took Mr. Rumsfeld and the Pentagon, and, yeah, the buck stops in the Oval Office, the President, one full year from March when the war began until March of this year before they were able to send me

a letter informing me that, at last, all of our troops were equipped with this body armor.

I asked how many young men or middle-age Reservists and Guardsmen may have lost their lives needlessly simply because this administration did not provide them with this basic protection. It is a question that I think needs to be analyzed and answered.

There is a continuing problem in the war zone. As I stand here in the Chamber of the people's House tonight, there are American soldiers in Iraq, in various cities in Iraq, who are using vehicles without proper armor. There is one company that the Pentagon has a contract with to provide up-armored Humvees for our military personnel. It is located in Fairfield, Ohio. It is called O'Gara-Hess and Eisenhardt. It is the company that has the ability and the contract with the Pentagon to produce these vehicles which provide a high degree of protection when our soldiers may drive over a roadside bomb, for example; and yet the Pentagon is only contracting for 300 of these up-armored Humvees per month, although thousands are needed in Iraq.

The company tells me that they are capable by November, if not sooner, of producing some 500 of these Humvees per month. What that means is if the President and the Secretary of Defense and those who make decisions regarding this matter at the Pentagon were willing to do so, they could have these up-armored vehicles in Iraq so that our troops would be protected much more quickly than they are willing to do.

I do not understand this. I simply do not understand why the President does not call Secretary Rumsfeld up and say, listen, there are reports that our troops need up-armored Humvees; I want this problem solved as quickly as possible. Do everything necessary; move heaven and Earth but get this problem solved.

A young West Point graduate from my district called me a few weeks ago. He had returned after spending 14 months in Iraq; and he said, Congressman, the Explorer you drive around is more armored and offers better protection than did the Humvee that I drove around the streets of Baghdad.

It troubles me that those of us who serve here in this Chamber and the President, who is the Commander in Chief, would allow this situation to continue when they can do something about it.

So if the President cannot think of any mistake he has made, I would offer this mistake. I would say to the President, you should not have sent our soldiers into battle without body armor, and you should not have our soldiers over there tonight without up-armored Humvees to provide them adequate protection.

### THE IRAQ WAR JUST KEEPS GETTING WORSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, America has suffered the worst defeat in memory, and not by any insurgents. The world is rightly shocked and appalled by the pictures from Iraq. Rogue U.S. soldiers have committed atrocities that sicken us. They have harmed Iraqi citizens. They have endangered every decent U.S. soldier, and they have turned more people against us. The world must know that America stands for justice, and that justice should be carried out quickly against those responsible for these despicable acts.

The Iraq war just keeps getting worse for America, Mr. President. For those who mistrusted us before, the pictures will inflame their rhetoric. For those who hate us, the pictures will impassion them to find new recruits.

Every decent American can only feel enraged that the sordid conduct of a few people will be portrayed worldwide as representative of our Nation.

Iraqis were insulted and humiliated, but seven officers have received only a reprimand, a slap on the wrist. They were not even demoted or discharged. The world will ask, is that what America calls justice? No, it is not; and this administration had better take this seriously.

The U.S. would have gone to war if our citizens had been treated like this in another country. Remember our outrage when they hung some of our people from a bridge. The administration's response is just one more mistake. It is completely inadequate.

Iraq has been a mistake from the beginning. The administration refused to get help and support from the international community, and the administration continues to spout rhetoric that no one in the whole world either believes or accepts. Every day, literally, the administration switches from one policy to another.

First, the Baathists were bad, aligned with Saddam and no friend to the U.S. Then the U.S. hired a Baathist general to try and get us out of the mess in Fallujah. Then the U.S. replaces the guy after Iraqis protest the general's role in Hussein's regime. Now a new guy is in; but the insurgents, heavily armed and fortified, have already rejected the new general.

Fighting has broken out in several cities, and U.S. artillery is shelling positions near the Baghdad airport. There have been more U.S. casualties, and U.S. soldiers remain in grave danger all over Iraq while the administration test-fires a few possible solutions.

Note, Mr. President, this is not a test. Iraq is not a laboratory. They are shooting real bullets, and we keep pretending we have a policy. Some say

Iraq is not like Vietnam. Iraq looks more and more like Vietnam every day.

In southeast Asia, there was always more reassuring rhetoric from a Democratic President, by the way, than there was truth or policy to back it up. In Iraq, there is all this talk of growing a democracy; but in reality, we are seeding a civil war, with our soldiers' blood right in the middle of the violence.

What is the American administration going to say. We are working on it? The Pentagon said a few hours ago that 135,000 U.S. soldiers will remain in Iraq at least through 2005. In other words, the only thing being handed over on June 30 is a bill of goods, meant more for the American people and the election than the Iraqis.

It is time this administration faced the American people and the truth of their mistakes. Either get an international solution now, before more U.S. lives are lost, or get out and admit you should have never gone into Iraq in the first place. All the rhetoric in the administration's arsenal can start a debate, but it cannot stop a bullet.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BLUMENAUER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

### EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

### 30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. PELOSI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the tremendous leadership of two of our colleagues, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN), and the 30-Something Working Group for taking the lead on this vital effort to talk to the next generation of Americans about issues that they care about.

Tonight, during the Special Order, our 30-Something Working Group has 1 hour to speak to the young people of America. It consists of 14 Members of Congress in their 30s, as it said. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is in his 20s, just turned 30. All regions of the United States are represented in the group and all aspects and the beautiful diversity of our country: the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. CARSON);

the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DAVIS); the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FORD); the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON); the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY); the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND); the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN); the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN); the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON); the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK); the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN); the gentleman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ); the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH); and the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER). How proud we are of them.

Democrats are committed to listening to and working with young people on issues they care about and that impact their lives, jobs, the economy, health care, higher education, globalization, and protecting the beautiful environment that is God's creation.

Over the past 8 months, our 30-Something Members have been on the road across America beginning a new dialogue with the next generation. Thirty-Something Members have traveled to Louisiana, Alabama, Massachusetts, Kentucky, Michigan, Florida, through the States that I have mentioned, their home States, talking to young people to hear their views on critical issues.

Two weeks ago, the 30-Something Working Group cohosted the Next Generation Democratic Summit. More than 250 18- to 30-year-olds came to Capitol Hill to discuss their concerns with Members of Congress and to share their insights about how to inspire other young people to be more engaged in government.

Today, we are launching another part of our effort to reach out to the next generation. This regular 30-Something hour is an exciting opportunity for House Democrats to have a national discussion with young Americans across the country. We certainly invite response from the young Americans.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues well know, all of us here in Congress have a responsibility to the next generation. We have received a precious gift, a privilege, of representing our districts in Congress and the wonderful responsibility to make the future better for the next generation. Not only do we have that responsibility as a Congress, but each of us has a responsibility to do that. Every decision that we make has an important bearing on the future. No one is impacted more by that than our young people.

So I am so very proud of our 30-Something Working Group and the leadership that they have assumed under the exceptional leadership of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

□ 2015

## AMERICA NEEDS SMART SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago on May 1, President Bush made a huge mistake when he stood in front of a banner that read "Mission Accomplished" and told the Nation that major combat operations in Iraq were over; huge error. The truth is that major combat operations are very far from being over. Of the 734 American soldiers who have died in Iraq, nearly 600 have died since the President claimed an end to major combat operations.

April of the year 2004 was just as devastating to our troop levels as April of the year 2003. To add insult to injury, the Bush administration continues to maintain its tight grip on the media, engaging in a brand of censorship that is at stark contrast with fundamental American values of freedom of speech and freedom of press, a mistake in every way in this country of ours.

First the Coalition Provisional Authority, which runs Iraq and which was created by the Bush administration, decided to create its own television operation to broadcast live to the United States 24 hours a day from Iraq. The point of C-SPAN Baghdad, as it was dubbed, was to put a positive spin on events and circumvent the major networks by transmitting directly to local and regional media outlets in the United States. This is not the first time Bush has attempted to control the media in Iraq.

Fearing that support for the Iraq war would fade if Americans caught sight of U.S. soldiers returning home in flag-draped caskets, the Bush administration banned all coverage and photography of dead soldiers' homecoming on military bases. Another gross mistake, our President has not attended any homecoming or burials to date.

There has to be a better way and there is, one that emphasizes brain instead of brawn, one that is consistent with American values, one that trusts Americans will do the right thing when they know the truth. I have introduced legislation to create a SMART security platform for the 21st century. SMART stands for Sensible Multilateral American Response to Terrorism. SMART treats war as an absolute last resort. It fights terrorism with stronger intelligence and multilateral partnerships. It controls the spread of weapons of mass destruction with a renewed commitment to nonproliferation, and it aggressively invests in the development of impoverished Nations with an emphasis on women's health and women's education in Third World countries.

SMART legislation promotes more effective conflict assessment and early warning systems, multilateral rapid re-

sponse mechanisms, human rights monitoring, civilian policing and investment in civil programs and fair judicial systems. SMART security is about promoting a foreign policy that is open and honest, not one that is cloaked in secrecy and hidden agendas.

If we cannot trust our government to pursue policies that are best for America, then I ask, who can we trust? The Bush doctrine has been tried; and it has failed. It is time for a new national security strategy. SMART Security defends America by relying on the very best of America: Our commitment to peace and freedom, our compassion for the people of the world, and our capacity for multilateral leadership. SMART Security is tough, it is pragmatic and it is patriotic. SMART Security is smart, and it will keep America safe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

## A QUESTION OF CREDIBILITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, page 23 of the Times today, the headline says, "Agency Sees Withholding of Medicare Data From Congress As Illegal." That is pretty serious business.

So we have finally secret documents. We have backroom deals. We have intimidation and misinformation. We have threats. We have exclusion, possible bribery, propaganda, lying. I am not referring to the KGB, I am not referring to the Chinese authorities, I am not referring to Napoleon's France, a medieval court, or Imperial Rome. No, there are elements of government scandal right here in the Medicare issue.

All of these things describe a significant role in the narrow passage of the Medicare prescription drug bill. Members may wonder here who, in the United States of America, the freest country in the world, would employ such tactics to pass a controversial Medicare law; the Bush administration, that is who. The White House position of win at any cost eventually did lead to the new law, but what was the cost? The cost has been the credibility and reputation not only of the administration but that of the Congress, the integrity of this institution and the entire law-making process.

The American people must ask themselves, is this how my government actually works? Everyone knew a Medicare prescription drug benefit was going to be expensive. To the end, the Bush administration assured Congress their plan would cost \$400 billion. However, it has since been discovered that

the White House knew 6 months before the vote that their bill had a price tag of \$140 billion more, a slight error of \$140 billion.

Further, it has been reported that the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services, their administrator, remember this name, Tom Scully, he since has gone and found himself a lobbying job. Well, old Tom threatened to fire the chief actuary who was responsible for calculating the cost of the bill. The actuary's name was Richard Foster. If he had made this information available to congressional Democrats, he was going to be fired. At the time, Mr. Scully was negotiating with health care interests that had large financial stakes in the Medicare bill. Not only about the bill though, Mr. Scully.

That is not to say Mr. Scully was in this alone. Last month, Mr. Scully told members of the Committee on Ways and Means that he had shared the information with Doug Badger, President Bush's health policy adviser, who is right in the White House, and James Capretta, associate director of the Office of Management and Budget, his analysis that the Medicare legislation would exceed its target goal.

Not only was this underhanded, not only was it deceitful, but according to the Congressional Research Service, this gag order was against the law, and they made this public just yesterday. There has been a violation of the law, and this House has done nothing, nor has the other House, nor have the folks down the street. When you break the law, something should happen.

According to the report, Congress' "right to receive truthful information from Federal agencies to assist in its legislative functions is clear and unsailable." That is what it says.

The issuance by an officer or employee in a department or agency of the Federal Government of a gag order on subordinate employees to expressly prevent and prohibit those employees from communicating directly with Members of Congress or the committees of Congress would appear to violate a specific and express prohibition of Federal law.

McGrain v. Dougherty, a 1927 Supreme Court decision, states very clearly, as it does in other Supreme Court decisions, legislative bodies cannot legislate wisely or effectively, in the absence of information regarding conditions which the legislation is intended to effect or change. That decision by the Supreme Court goes back to 1927. Thus, "Political gamesmanship must yield to the clear public interest of providing the people's elected representatives in the Congress with accurate and truthful information."

Mr. Speaker, they have broken the law. I come to this floor always with bipartisan hands open. My legislation will show that. The gloves are off.

Mr. Speaker, you have been lied to; we have been lied to. The question is, what will we do about it? The question is, do not the American people deserve

more, and should the people demand more from us, regardless of which side we are on? We did not know all of the facts, and that bill would not have passed if we did know all of the facts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CONYERS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

#### MISSION ACCOMPLISHED, I THINK NOT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I watched the weekends events somewhat in horror, but also somewhat in recognition that our troops on the ground, our enlisted officers, Reservists and National Guard, operate under the most heinous conditions, and certainly the actions that we have seen in the abuse of Iraqi prisoners is not to be excused, but I lay the burden more on the policymakers and those who have extended the stays of those civilian troops, 6 months, 12 months and 18 months, those who made the statement a year ago May 1, "mission accomplished." The burdens of disarray of the military in Iraq lay at our feet.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we cannot, as a Congress, do nothing. I would hope that we will hear more potently from the President, the Secretary of Defense, and the Joint Chief of Staff on the solutions in the aftermath and the crisis of a so-called mission accomplished.

Although those acts were to be not tolerated, we must find the trail of hierarchy that created such havoc that our soldiers who were there to liberate, have turned into those who would perpetrate such acts. That is what I want to speak about this evening: Mission accomplished, I think not. Until we pass what I am now calling, and we are now reviewing and hoping to write as legislation for this House, the Welcome Home Act of 2004. Mission accomplished, I think not. Until we write legislation for those combat veterans who have come home from Iraq and Afghanistan, really, the Vietnam War of the 21st century.

And what do I believe is appropriate for those wounded and those individ-

uals coming home from this war? First of all, an apology and explanation by this administration for the war and the present status of the conditions in Iraq and, yes, Afghanistan. Provisions for long-term mental health needs for those veterans, both wounded and those not wounded and their families; immediate treatment for trauma, mental trauma if you will, that will be ongoing and that we have already discovered in some of our military hospitals today; continuous educational opportunities for these young men and women, and maybe even the Reservists and the National Guard who now come home with a whole different attitude about life and their future; family counseling, so that the terrible murder of a military spouse of a returning veteran cannot happen again; enhanced opportunities for homeownership so our military families are not in cramped conditions after the military person leaves the particular branch and so they are not Nicole Goodwin, an Iraqi combat veteran who is now homeless, walking the streets of New York; health care for 10 years so that those ailments generated by the combat situation and the Veterans Hospital will not maintain and keep, we will have care; long-term health care and rehabilitation when the veteran's benefits run out; military whistleblower protections so that those individuals who have seen things in Iraq that should not happen, such as what happened in the prison and the abuse of prisoners or what is happening in terms of those individuals who are outside of their job description of which they were brought into the military, where carpenters are being police officers and truck drivers are being gunners, we need to find out what is wrong with this system and this war.

□ 2030

Provisions for those who are severely injured with long-term understanding of those severely injured and the families who lost loved ones. Who is attending to those families after the burial? Who is comforting them, and what are the resources being provided for those families? And so I would suggest that a lump-sum payment under the Welcome Home Act of 2004 be made to those families of the severely injured and those who lost loved ones out of the profits of the Iraqi oil fields.

Mr. Speaker, mission accomplished, I think not, until the Welcome Home Act of 2004 is both legislatively presented to this Congress, until we acknowledge the wrongness of this war by giving some dignity to those who are coming home, who are coming home to lonely places, to homelessness, to bad health care, to the inability to provide for their family. We must provide for these severely injured veterans as well as those families who have lost loved ones because, as we know, the toll of those dying continues to rise; and 736, Mr. Speaker, is not the last count that we will have. How can we

claim a mission accomplished unless we present the Welcome Home Act of 2004 alongside a final resolution to the conflict in Iraq?

#### NATIONAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, the President, as you can see from the poster, said at his press conference last week that he was not aware of any mistakes that he had made. Let me tell my colleagues and him a few mistakes he has made, three major mistakes:

First, in the immediate aftermath of 9/11, the Bush administration chose deliberately to mislead the people of New York about the safety of the air and the environment in the aftermath of that disaster. We now know from the Inspector General of EPA's report that the White House instructed the EPA to mislead the people of New York. The former administrator of EPA, Mrs. Whitman, said 2 days after the disaster the air is safe to breathe, when they had no test data to show that.

Because of that misleading, Federal, State, and city government followed policies that have resulted in catastrophe. We now know from recent medical reports that an absolute majority, most of the first responders, the heroes, the fire officers, the police officers, the construction workers who descended on Lower Manhattan to help with the rescue operations, most of them now, 2½ years later, have serious respiratory disorders which will probably plague them for the rest of their lives. We know that women who live within a mile, 1.6 kilometers, of the World Trade Center, today are giving birth to low birth weight babies at twice the natural rate because the White House chose to mislead the American people.

Second, the White House chose to get us into a useless, stupid war in Iraq to divert our attention from the war against us by the Islamic terrorists. We know that there were no weapons of mass destruction, contrary to what they told us in Iraq, no great stockpiles of weapons of mass destruction. We know the Iraqi people did not, as the White House told us they would, greet our troops as liberators. We know that when the President stood there before the sign and said mission accomplished and said that major combat was over, he was wrong. We know this administration did not plan adequately for an occupation. We know they sent too few troops there to properly secure the country. We know they fired General Shinseki because he had the impudence to say the truth in advance. We know that they disbanded the Iraqi army without having enough troop strength to replace it and they are now trying to reassemble it.

We know, in short, they got us into a quagmire and so thoroughly alienated

the rest of the world by the arrogant attitude of this administration that we cannot get any significant help, we cannot internationalize the conflict, we cannot share the burdens or at least we cannot do these things as long as George Bush is President because no one trusts him abroad anymore.

But perhaps the greatest mistake that this administration has made is that this administration has not and does not take seriously enough the terrorist war being waged against us by the Islamic terrorists. From before 9/11, when this administration ignored many warnings, to this very day, they refuse to spend the money necessary to protect the American people. Two months after 9/11, leaders in Congress proposed to spend \$10 billion to protect our chemical and nuclear facilities and our transportation terminals against attacks that could kill or wound hundreds of thousands of people. President Bush said he would veto such an appropriation. It was not done. This administration refuses to spend the money to buy the weapons grade plutonium and uranium now in the former Soviet Union that can easily be smuggled to al Qaeda to make atomic bombs because they care more about tax cuts for the wealthy than about protecting the American people. It is a mistake not to prevent al Qaeda from going nuclear by buying that plutonium and uranium quickly.

This administration inspects only 2 percent of the 6 million shipping containers that come into this country every year, any one of which could hide a chemical or biological or nuclear weapon. It is a mistake not to insist that no container is placed on a ship bound for the United States until that container is inspected and certified and sealed by an American inspection team in the foreign port.

This administration will not spend the funds to protect our commercial aviation. It is a mistake not to place a missile deflection system on every commercial airliner as the Israelis are doing by this summer so that we do not have to worry about our airlines being shot out of the sky by shoulder-fired missiles. In short, it is a mistake not to place the priority where it belongs, on protecting the American people from terrorism instead of protecting tax cuts for the wealthy.

Mr. Speaker, if the President wants to know about some mistakes, here are some mistakes. Here are some mistakes that he can correct if he is willing to protect the American people at the cost of the tax cuts for the wealthy. His major mistake is his priority. Tax cuts for the wealthy, yes. Protect the American people from terrorism, no. That is some mistake.

#### REPORT OF 30-SOMETHING CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Flor-

ida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to address the House and the American people on this afternoon. I must say that this is not only a great opportunity but a historic opportunity to address the House. I was very honored to see and hear the Democratic leader, NANCY PELOSI, share her appreciation for the 30-Something Caucus that she created here in this House to address the American people on a weekly basis. And so this is our first evening coming together. We will have some Members that are 30-plus, maybe in their lower 40s, but all of the ladies that will come forth tonight, they are all in their 20s, so they do not quite want to admit that they are in the 30-Something Caucus, but we do have Members that have been in this body and as a part of this body on the Democratic side who came in at a very young age.

I think, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House and also the American people, it is very important that we have Members here so we have a diversity of not only representation but a voice as it relates to the future and especially for those individuals, I am 37 years old and I am going to be in a situation very soon, I have young children that are going to have to attend college. So what is happening right now in this House and what is happening in this country is so very, very important to me, not only as a Member of Congress but also to individuals that work hard every day.

I just wanted to rehash what the leader shared with us a little earlier today when she took the floor this evening, about maybe 30 minutes ago. She created a 30-Something Caucus, Leader PELOSI did, amongst House Democrats. There are 14. We work day in and day out to make sure that we talk about the issues and point out issues that are happening here in this House and making sure that we have results or recommendations for results. There is only so much that we can do in the minority; but if we continue to work hard toward those issues, then we can bring about the kind of change that is needed for the country, that means for individuals that are Democrats, Republicans and Independents. Also, this is going to provide an opportunity for us to be interactive with the American people through e-mail and also through other means of communications to make sure that we provide the best kind of representation that is possible, especially for individuals that are approaching college, parents that are thinking about sending their children to college, making sure that it is affordable and that it is there for them.

I would like to call on the gentleman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ), who has been such an outstanding Member of this body and also a good voice not only for her district in California which she represents, the

39th District, but being my freshman sister here in this 108th Congress.

Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I am here this evening to talk about an issue that is very near and dear to my heart and that is the need for access to higher education. A long time ago, a college education was reserved for the well-to-do, not something that an ordinary citizen could readily achieve. But over time, that changed and now a college education is no longer a privilege of just a few but a necessity to achieve any kind of job security in our very fluid economy.

But, sadly, just as a college education has become an absolutely crucial component of obtaining a good job, the Bush administration is making it harder and harder to access and afford a college education. As a 30-something Member of Congress, and I will admit to the gentleman from Florida I am in my 30s, I am here to speak on behalf of young people who are struggling to achieve the American dream of a decent college education. Rather than burdening today's young people with overwhelming debt, there are several things that we can do to help. We need to slow down the tuition hikes and encourage States to maintain their commitment to higher education. And we should double the Pell grant award and make it available year round.

Finally, we should implement Senator JOHN KERRY's idea for \$50 billion in tax credits to help Americans afford all 4 years of college. The typical loan debt has nearly doubled over the past 10 years for the average student, with 64 percent of students needing to borrow money to finance their college education. I too struggled to make college and law school a reality. As it turned out, all seven children in my family were fortunate enough to obtain a college degree. But we all did it with the assistance of Federal grants and Federal loans, loans, I might add, that I will be paying off until I am in my 60s.

Despite the fact that we came from immigrant parents who did not speak much of the language when they first got here and were of limited economic means, all seven of my brothers and sisters and I graduated from a college institution. Most amazingly, however, my mother returned to school after the youngest of her seven children started kindergarten and she went to night school to earn her 2-year degree and later transferred to a 4-year institution and graduated from college in her late 40s to become a bilingual education teacher. That is how strongly she believed in a quality education and in showing and demonstrating to us that education was truly the key to the American dream in this country.

I find that the current atmosphere that works against students who are trying to finance their way through school is really something that undermines many of the American values that we hold dear. Overwhelming debt



can force students to take on jobs to try to work their way through school to the detriment of their education, or in some instances students forgo college all together assuming that the expensive and exorbitant tuition hikes are far out of their reach. In the past year alone, tuition has increased an average of 14 percent at 2- and 4-year public institutions, and it has increased 6 percent at 4-year private schools. That is just in 1 year. That is not even counting the fact that the cost of living keeps rising and things like rent and food and books go up as well.

In response, President Bush has ignored the tuition problem, cut or frozen student aid, and levied higher taxes onto students. If we do not have an education President, then we definitely need to have an education Congress. I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to break with their President and fight for education support for our young people. Let us send the President legislation making education more affordable and more accessible to all, and let us dare him to sign it. The bottom line is that the leadership in Congress needs to stop talking about education and actually do something about it.

I again thank the gentleman from Florida for allowing me to speak this evening.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I thank the gentlewoman from California so very much. I want to say on just a few of her points, talking about the real cost of tuition, we talk about students, we talk about the cost of young people having to foot the bill, we talk about students leaving the college experience, the higher educational experience if they get through, if they can afford it, carrying on a great deal of debt that starts them off in the working world already in the hole. They went to school to be able to help America be stronger and also help themselves to be able to get the kind of job they need to be able to provide for their families and be able to buy a home.

□ 2045

And what she is saying is very real. She took part in the 30-Something or the Young Leaders conference that the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) had, and we all participated in it. And I just would appreciate it if she could share a few of the stories that some of the students shared with her about their experiences about trying to afford college because many of them work here in this House, many of them attend school right now, and they are running into you know what trying to pay for college.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I have heard from a number of young people all across the United States about the burden of taking on that debt and trying to even work their way through college at the same time that they are assuming debt. It is very common now that a degree that used to take 4 years in order

to complete now takes 5 or 6. I have heard of people who have actually, once they have graduated, have been so saddled with the huge debt of trying to repay their student loans. They have had to move in with their parents because the job economy and the job prospects are not bright for them.

In many instances it can take several years for them to be self-sufficient, actually land a job to where they can be self-sufficient. Meanwhile, their student loan payments come due because they can only defer them for so long, and what we are finding is many young people, after they have worked to try to either get a 4-year degree or an advanced degree, meet somebody, fall in love, and marry, they are having to wait an average of 4 years longer to purchase their first home because of the staggering student loan payments that they have to make monthly, and it is a very sad thing because I was brought up with my parents telling me that education is the key to success in this country. If one gets a college degree and a good education, the world is their oyster, and that is simply not the case for many young people today.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we have two different educational experiences beyond high school now. We have our 2-year institutions that are community colleges that many working people have to use to be able to receive a higher education, not because they could not get into a 4-year institution. Many times they have to stay home, Mr. Speaker, to help pay bills. They cannot afford, because of a lack of income or a sick family member, to move away.

So they do their first 2 years at community colleges. Then we have another group of individuals that graduate from high school, moving on to a 4-year institution, and they also have to foot their own way through college, or a parent has to pick up an additional job or ask other family members to participate in helping to pay for one's educational experience.

And while the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ) is here, I want to make sure that we share with the American people what is going on in this Congress now. Many times people ask, Okay, Democrats, what do you stand for? I mean, it is one thing to describe the problem. It is another thing to make sure that we can talk about and act upon solutions. And I will tell my colleagues that as it relates to doubling the maximum Pell grant award to \$11,600 by 2010, I must say that this is a commitment that should be fulfilled because right now we have the typical student that nearly doubled themselves in debt.

Sixty-four percent of them are \$17,000 in debt when they walk across the stage, thinking that they are going to a job, that is, if they have a job, that may be able to help pay down that debt, and we have more students in America, young people, whose loans are falling in default, and one of the

things that I picked up at the conference, so it is so very important that we listen, the banks are now marching to the Hill with the majority. Republicans are saying, well, we have a plan for student loans. And I get kind of concerned when banks start coming with a plan for students.

And I do not know, I am not speaking from experience, but I know people who have gone through this. Right now we have banks, Mr. Speaker, that if one overdraws, it is a \$29 fee. These are the same individuals that are coming to the Hill that are getting the attention of congressional leaders that they have a plan for young people. They are trying to do away with making sure that students can have a fixed rate to be able to make sure that they can pay their loans down, and when we do not have this fixed rate, the Congressional Research Service that we call CRS said "by eliminating the current consolidation low-fixed rate benefit would force a typical student who has borrowed within \$17,000 in debt to pay an additional . . ."

This is a tax, Mr. Speaker. I am going to put it this way. When we have a \$7.1 trillion deficit, the highest deficit in the history of the republic, and at the same time we are providing tax cuts to millionaires who are not even asking for it because we can, this is what happens. We continue to fleece our future and fleece the dreams of these Americans. And I just want to mention, before I yield to the gentlewoman, that under the fixed rate as it relates to interest, \$3,948. Under a variable rate, that is the banks' plan, the big banks' plan that I must say is getting wind behind the sails here in this Congress, which is the reason why I am glad the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) has brought us together because she needs the opportunity to be the Speaker of this House so that we can get some legislation and make sure we insulate the protections that students have now, under a variable rate, \$9,432.

So when we look at it, \$3,948 under a fixed; under a variable where banks make more money, students pay longer, and more students go into default, \$9,432, this is counterproductive. These are the things that we have to talk about, and these are the things that we have to legislate against.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, if I could add a couple of things on to that, not only are the banking institutions trying to change the law to move away from a fixed rate to a variable rate, they are also trying to pass along the costs of generating these loans, more of the costs, on to students. Right now when students trying to take out students loans, they are responsible for their loan generation fees which end up being about \$500 on average. So that is a further burden that is added to the students. Now they are trying to pass more of those costs on to the students.

And, sadly, if we think about this in the long term, banks get these loans

guaranteed by the Federal Government. That is our tax dollars. And every time somebody defaults on a student loan, it is the taxpayers who are coming to the rescue to pick it up. The banks have very little risk for these loans, and yet they want to make the interest rates fluid so that they can generate more profit, all the while fully knowing that if the loan becomes unbearable for a student to pay back and they default, they do not have to worry about it because the taxpayers step in and pay the bill.

I just think that is wrong fundamentally to put that burden back on the taxpayers when we should be trying to move in the other direction to make these loans affordable for students so that they do not default so that the payback rate increases, which, again, is more sound for the economy and again saves taxpayers money in the long run.

So with that, I will yield back to the gentleman and allow him to continue on the discussion on higher education this evening.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we just had another colleague join us. But I want to share with the American people, like I said, we are interactive here. We want to make sure that we hear from the American people. We want to make sure that we take them up on their suggestions. And the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ) is welcome to stay as long as she can. I know we all have schedules. But we are here to listen, and we are here to act.

For the Democratic leader, and I must add, female leader of any major party, to come here tonight to put emphasis on a weekly commitment of being here in this Chamber to make sure that we do not continue to see young people and families in debt because we feel that we are giving them one thing, okay, we will give them a \$200 or \$300 tax cut, but at the same time, we are pulling the carpet out from under them to allow their family to educate themselves better, to be able to provide for their families.

I want to commend the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for pulling us together, letting us know that our purpose here in this Congress is very important.

I want to give an e-mail address out. I want to make sure that the American people know that they can communicate with us on the topics that we should talk about in the future or topics that we are talking about now and also personal stories that not only working families are going through, trying to make sure they put money aside for students to be able to receive affordable tuition or that they can be able to provide for their children, 30somethingdems@mail.house.gov.

They can send us e-mails. They can send us battles that they are fighting. They can also send us recommendations so that we can legislate better on behalf of them.

We also have someone who is joining us who is also one of our anchors here tonight, and I am so glad. I know the American people, nine times out of ten, think there is probably not a lot going on here, but there is a lot going on and we are so glad the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) can join us. He is from Ohio, Congressional District 17, one of the youngest members, if not the youngest member, of the 30-Something group that the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) put together, and is a dear friend and colleague. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida and the gentlewoman from California for bringing up these issues. I just recently moved up into the 30-Something. I was in the 29 something caucus all by myself before we started here.

A couple of issues. I missed the beginning of the special order here, but I have three universities in my district. I have a local campus, branch campus of one of those universities, and I think the one issue that I faced being in the State Senate in Ohio with tuition increases going up by 10, 15 percent across the board, is that the one issue that young kids and young students could sniff out more than anything else is when someone is trying to pull the wool over their eyes, when someone is trying to tell them one thing and do something else. And the last presidential election, the students, the college students, the technical students, of this country were promised by the President of the United States that he was going to raise the Pell grant award to \$5,100 for all freshmen students. Now today the maximum Pell grants is still \$4,050.

So we try to engage young students, we try to engage young people into the process, and we try to tell them that we care about their needs. But here once again in 2000 they were told one thing by a typical politician, as they would see it and they would call it, who would promise one thing and then something else happened. They did not deliver on the promise. And, again, I heard the gentleman from Florida reiterate, as has been reiterated many times here in this Chamber, that again we have the priorities for the top 1 percent. They are the people that we care about. We garner all the energy of this Chamber to help the top 1 percent. But we cannot make one move to help college students. And as he said, I am sure in Florida it is the same way as it is in Ohio: 10 percent this year, 10 percent next year, 13 percent the next year, 15 percent the next year for college education.

And these are the States that are getting hardest hit by the job loss. So they lose their job or they are underemployed; so they go from a job making 15 or 20 bucks an hour with health insurance down to 9 bucks an hour. Now they are at Sam's Club, now they

are at Super-K, now they are at Kohl's or Bed, Bath & Beyond, trying to make ends meet for their family, and they have a 15 percent tuition increase to try to make ends meet for their kids.

So I am glad that the leader has also organized this. This is a great opportunity, I think, for us to try to address some of the issues here in the United States Congress and let people know out there, let young students know out there on a Tuesday night at nine o'clock, as they are flipping through watching Comedy Central or MTV or VH1, that they could maybe tune in here once a week, and they do not have to do it every night, but once a week find out there are Members of the United States Congress that are trying to address some of their needs.

I know we have some other speakers. I would be happy to stick around and talk a little bit.

□ 2100

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I want to thank the gentleman for identifying this, and really this is about a discussion. We want everyone to share opening statements, but I think it is important that we talk about these issues.

Once again, I want to make sure this is not the report of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) or the report of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) or the report of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ) or the report of the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

These are reports produced by the Congress. These are reports produced by reputable institutions in the United States of America that are looking out for costs to the American people and looking out for our future as it relates to a workforce.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, that is right. If the gentleman would yield further, I would say to the young students who may be watching this or may hear about this through their college newspapers, that they can check the statistics. We are not going to stand on the floor of the House of Representatives and try to lie to you. We are going to present to you statistics we have had verified, information we have had verified from members of our staffs and different organizations.

Check it out. It is not us saying it. It is not a Democrat or Republican issue. Unfortunately, the Congress has been controlled by the Republicans for a good many years, the White House has been in the hands of the Republicans for now 3½ years, and the Senate has been in Republican hands for a few years now. If they wanted to address the needs of college students in the United States of America, they had the opportunity.

Time and time again, we took the opportunity to engage the top 1 or 2 percent, to make sure they got hundreds of thousands of dollars back in some instances. So this is a priority issue for this Congress; and if you do not believe

us, go right ahead and check our facts, just the facts.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, let me share one other thing with the gentleman. I want to make sure the American people understand we are listening, and we will continue to listen. Not only young people, but parents that are facing this problem and grandparents that are now having to reach into their honey pot, however big it may be, of money they put aside, hard-earned money they put aside to help educate their children. Because the future of the bloodline is to make sure we have an affordable education system.

Democrats, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) and all of us in this Chamber, stand united in ending the \$500 unfair student loan tax, which is the origination fee that the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ) spoke about. That is the fee that banks celebrate. That is the cream on the top. That is the "we are already going to make a load of money off of interest rates, but we are going to add another fee on." These are the things that individuals do not realize that are taxes that they are paying that they should not have to pay.

Also providing the Public Service Scholarships for up to \$17,500, and loan forgiveness for high-qualified graduates to teach in our schools, in nursing, child welfare and other high-priority public service careers that are there, and at the same time doubling the maximum Pell grant award to \$11,600 by the year 2011.

Mr. Speaker, I want to bring on the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS). We spoke of the \$7.1 trillion deficit. That is a lot of money. As we go to make tax cuts permanent, this means that the education opportunity for young people and for parents who want to educate their children, I know this time of night I am usually either eating or we are putting children to bed, and I am going to tell you what is on my mind. On my mind is, can I afford it? And let me tell you, this is not about me, because, guess what? Many of us in this Chamber, we are going to be okay. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN), the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ), we are going to be okay, because we are Members of Congress and we are respected members of our community and we have some level of influence. Individuals may want to help our children.

But what happens to that individual who is not a Member of Congress? What happens to that individual that works every day, that is punching in and punching out, trying to live honestly? How do they educate their children? That is where the rubber meets the road. That is why we need the opportunity.

My good friend and colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS), no relation, he said that he is

"meek" when he is in Miami and I am "meeks" when I am in New York. I thank the gentleman for joining us.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. I felt compelled to join. I wish I was part of the 30-Something Club. I just joined the 50-Something Club. But just sitting here listening, I want to compliment those who are members of the 30-Something Club because America really is dependent upon you. Therefore, it becomes important for those of us in Congress to make sure that life is better for our children than it was for us.

Now, I sit here as a Member of Congress, as the gentleman indicated. I have three daughters, two of whom are in college. As the gentleman said, they are going to be all right. But their father can relate to what you are talking about, because I come from a very poor home. I grew up in public housing, and my parents understood that in order for my family to be better that education was the key. But they could not afford it, so when it was time for me to go to college, the only solution for me was to take out school loans.

Guess what? Even that was not enough. So my parents, my father, took a second job, my mother went back to work, and they had to borrow personal money themselves.

Now, the point I am trying to make is that then when I graduated, I went on and was one of those guys that was ambitious. It was not only 4 years of undergraduate school, but, as some people know today, you do not stop simply with a BA necessarily. But if you want to go on to do other things, if you want to go to graduate school, in my case it was law school, there was an additional 3 years of student loans that I had to take and sacrifice that my parents had to make.

So when I was able to leave school and took a prominent job as an assistant district attorney, when you look at the salary that I was making, equal to my companion, one would think, but I had these tremendous school loans that I had to pay back. So while they could go on and live in a decent apartment, I had to go back to live with my parents, for two reasons: number one, I had to pay my loans; number two, I had to help them pay for their loans that they took out for my education.

So for the first almost 7 years of my adult life working as a prosecutor I was still living at home, simply because of economics, simply because I had to help myself and at the same time help my parents who made the kind of sacrifices they made.

We should do better than that in Congress. We should not want to continue that burden or give an extra burden to our young people. We are, in fact, the richest country on the planet; and then we give tax cuts just to the richest 1 or 2 percent of Americans and say to our young people, we are not going to think about you. Or we know, as the gentleman said, that we are \$7.1 trillion in debt, and guess what? Those of us who are 50-something, we are not

really going to have to pay it. We are going to leave those burdens to you guys who are 30-something and 20-something. So you are going to inherit the debt. But on top of the debt, you are going to inherit from this country, we are going to pile on school loans, so you can never get out of it.

Or are we trying to set up a system where you have an elitist class, where only the top 1 or 2 percent can afford to send their kids to college? Why? They will not have to take out any school loans, because their parents are able to afford it and pay for it all.

So this work becomes important, what you are doing. I take my hat off to our leader, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), for what she is doing; and I take my hat off to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK), and to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ), who was here, because they are leading America, and America only changes when young people move.

That is why I hope people get into these Members' e-mail and start e-mailing and commenting and giving some comments, because to me the future of America lies only with the young people; and we need these people and their involvement and their ideas.

I will tell you as an older individual who just entered the 50-Something Club that you will have an ally in me and many others in this Democratic conference, particularly, that will push to make sure that your America is a better America for all than it is today.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I want to thank the gentleman, because the 30-somethings are always looking for some support from the 50-somethings, without a doubt. But I think the gentleman raised a couple of very good points.

The one point is, let us think about a young student today who may be just finishing up high school, or a sophomore or junior in high school, getting ready to go, or maybe a kid 10 or 12 years old. What kind of student loan burden are they going to have? If the colleges, public universities go 10 percent, 10 percent, 10 percent, 10 percent over the next 4 or 5 years, Pell grants are not adjusted for inflation, the same problems with the student loans, we tack on more user fees and everything else, and then the debt from the tax cuts. So by the time they get through law school, if they are 15 now, by the time they are 27, 28, 30 years old, they have all of that educational burden. Then they have the burden that we are putting on them from the past 2 or 3 years here.

Where is the economic machine going to move at that point when you have so much debt? We are really putting chains not only on our kids, but on the economy. That is one point I would like to make.

The other point I thought of is that not only are we strapping ourselves

with our debt, but we have less kids that are going to be on the border that we need to create the new economy. We do not know what the new economy is going to be. We know it is not industry. We know industry has been on the decline for the last 30 years, trade agreements we have signed and a variety of other issues, whatever they may be, technology. So what is the new economy going to be? The best thing we can do is just educate these young kids and say, you go out and create it. We do not know what it is going to be yet.

So I appreciate the gentleman stopping down, and hopefully he can make it down in the next weeks and months to come.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I will add to that, if I may, initially, you can go back to my time and before, we were competing with individuals within our State or individuals within our tri-state region or even just individuals within our Nation. But the gentleman is so right. Right now our students have to compete with other students all across this globe because of the global economy and how it is now all intersected and interconnected.

What we are really talking about here is the national defense of America, and the national defense of America depends upon the education of our young people. If we close that opportunity down by making it unaffordable to them, then we are really putting our country in a great, great danger of not being able to continue the greatness that we have thus far.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. The great investment of the GI Bill, which sprang our economy into the world domination we now have. I look at my grandparents' generation, who many accessed the GI Bill, doctors, lawyers and engineers.

The space program, it was not just about going to the Moon; it was about getting mathematicians and scientists and engineers and physicists. They were not all going to work for NASA, but they went out into the private sector and drove this economy forward throughout the '50s, '60s, and '70s when we had a lot of success. We need to make those investments again.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. What I am glad to hear and see, especially the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS), many times I think people know the glory, but they do not know the story. The story is real. The story is, as one comedian said, you had to move back in with your parents, write your name on the orange juice container, and sleep in the den. But you had to do it.

The real issue is, especially for a majority of this Congress on the Republican side, standing firm to make sure that millionaires receive a permanent tax break, so that we would have in the very near future a \$7.1 trillion deficit.

I am looking for the deficit hawks every day. I am saying, where are they? The folks that used to take the floor on the other side, the Republican

side used to jump up and talk about the deficit every 2 minutes, when it was this Congress, the Democratically controlled Congress that balanced the budget. President Clinton balanced the budget that put forth the opportunities for young people.

And when we are talking about young people, I say to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS), we are talking about you. We are talking about what you have to pay, what your constituents have to pay, my constituents, towards educating their children in the real world.

In the real world, many of these individuals that we are talking about here tonight, they cannot walk into a conventional bank and say, I want to get a loan for my children's education. They have to go and mortgage their homes. They get a second mortgage. They even go into the sub-prime mortgages, which is the high interest rate, because it is their children. As a parent, you will do anything to make sure that your children have a better opportunity than what you have had.

Just for a minute, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) shared with us where he came from and how he got here and what he had to do as a young prosecutor in New York.

I know the story of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN). I remember when we first got here, the gentleman said, the last time I was here I was passing out papers in the hall and I worked for a Member of Congress.

I thought that it was not only quite amusing, but I want to make sure that people know we did not just drop out of the sky and end up here in Congress.

We also are Americans. We have gone through some things. We want to make sure that people like us do not have to continue to go through things, especially when we can provide and do better.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. That is right. I think a lot of people out there listening now who are young students who may not be tuning in tonight but, may be in the future, I do not think if you cross-reference the stories of those of us who are standing here, probably many of the Members here, the stories would be much different.

□ 2115

You work hard, you go to college, you get a summer job, you work in a steel mill in the summer, you cut grass in the summer, you do what you can to help move things along, and you hope that you are blessed with families who help you, parents who support you, grandparents who want to step in and support you to make sure that you can have what you have. That is becoming less and less available.

I think part of the reason I am here is because I was blessed to have a family who was able to help me out. I was blessed to have a summer job. Kids today are not even going to be able to get a summer job, because the market is so terrible that people who have been

unemployed for the last 7 or 8 months are taking the summer jobs FROM the college kids, so that job I got cutting grass at Trumbull County and I would drive the thing on the side of the highway and drop the arm down to cut grass to make 6 bucks an hour so you would have money in the summer so you were not a further burden, those jobs are not available. The summer employment working the steel mill on the midnight shift, those jobs are not available because no one is hiring.

So there is a connection to all of this. It is not just about the student loans, it is about the economy, it is about the tax decisions that we are making here, it is about the money we are spending, it is about the deficits, it is about the irresponsible fiscal policies that we have here that are all, that are all affecting this for all students and people who are going to get a 2-year degree, or do not even go to school at all. They are still affected by the job market.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, just to the point, I have some information here. I am so glad the gentleman from Ohio segued into summer jobs. I worked in the summer and I worked every summer. I had to because my mom was like, you are going to go out and you are going to work. So right now, we have the Center For Labor and Market Studies at Northeastern University in Boston saying, right now we are experiencing the lowest job opportunity; summer jobs for teens this summer are expected to be at the worst since World War II, since the end of World War II. And I think it is so very, very important for us to see that and understand that.

Kids that are going to be released from school soon that are going to have all day and idle minds to sit at home or even to get in trouble. They are usually productive because we provide an opportunity for those individuals to go out and get a job to hopefully help mom, dad or grandpa, whatever the case may be, are not going to have that opportunity.

Not only the fact that we have a bad job growth experience right now in the United States, but the fact that companies that would usually carry out that goodwill gesture of saying, I am hiring some kids this summer, I am putting them to work, I am going to do the right thing, they cannot afford it. They cannot afford to do so, because they do not even have the job to give to a full-time person, their unemployment has expired and they do not have health care.

I just wanted to give that point out.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, that has a lot of residual effect, actually, just on that, particularly for somebody who may come from a very poor neighborhood. Because what happens with a lot of those summer jobs, I am again being one of them and I could talk about some of my constituents, et cetera, they get exposed to different things they may never be exposed to by

that summer job, and that summer job gives them the motivation to continue to go to school to do something.

But one of the other things I wanted to say that the gentleman from Ohio indicated which is very important, which I think that a lot of those of us who are, especially the 60-somethings and the 70-somethings now, should have institutional memory, because the gentleman from Ohio touched upon the fact that when they went to school on the GI Bill, et cetera, that they were able to become doctors and lawyers and accountants, et cetera.

Well, let us take New York State, for example. Many of them back then had nothing to pay for school. Because if you went to the City University of New York or the State University in New York, tuition was free. That is what made us progress so quickly from the 1940s to the 1960s, because we began and understood the importance in investing in education of our young people and we made higher education in public institutions free.

And now, the gentleman gave the statistics or the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ) gave the statistics earlier on, how every year the percentage on tuition rates are going up in our public institutions, and we will not have any money to help subsidize our public institutions. Why? Because we are \$7.1 trillion in debt. So, therefore, we cannot help anybody who cannot do anything, because there is not going to be any money.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I find comfort in the fact that we will be back next week to have a similar discussion, and each week we are going to try to move to another subject on the issues that have arisen that week. But I just want to pause 1 minute and make sure that folks know, because we want to continue to listen to the American people and what they have to say about this. Thirty-Somethingdems at mail dot house dot gov, that is 30somethingdems, all one word, D-E-M-S, at mail.house.gov. I want to make sure that we understand how this thing works.

I used to be a member of the State legislature in Florida for about 8 years prior to my arrival here. I want to make sure the American people understand, because Members of Congress definitely understand, but the majority, the Republicans are looking the other way. That is the reason why we need an opportunity. Democrats need an opportunity to stand for all Americans. We are not here talking about the Democratic young person or working family experience. We are talking about the American family experience. We are talking about where the rubber meets the road. We are not talking about a cable news show where you have 30 minutes on there and the dialogue is already slanted towards a particular position. We are talking about what is happening every day in America.

I have constituents, and these student loan individuals call every day, harassing them, terrorizing them. And then, better yet, we have the banks that are fueling these individuals to say, we do not want a fixed rate, we want a variable rate, and they will say, well, it is low at the beginning and then eventually it has ballooned to the point where the interest rate is a tax on individuals. So I just want to mention how these things work.

The gentleman from New York mentioned a \$7 trillion deficit. So when we cut the Federal commitment to the States, the State governments, they look for the prey. Where can they cut? They are not like us. I mean we can go and, well, let us see, what credit card are we going to use today? We will use this one. We are just going to continue to charge. We are going to continue to knock on the door of the Bank of China saying, we need more money to pay down on the interest, not the debt, but just on the interest of the debt. They cannot do that.

So what they do, they go and they pull in the chancellor of the university system and say, hey, listen, it all rolls downhill and students end up footing the bill of additional tuition increases. So what does that mean, an increase? One may say, well, it is not bad. They are just students. No, it hits home. Because guess what? Parents have to help. I mean the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) talked about it. You have to come up again out of your wallet and guess what? You cannot afford to pull out your credit card every time. You have to go in this part of your wallet, which mine is empty at this particular time, you have to go into this part of your wallet and pull cash out or go to a family member or go to the credit union, or go to the title loan company, or go to a prime interest rate to make sure that your kid can stay in school.

I just want to make sure the American people understand how this thing rolls downhill. When a Federal commitment is cut, the State has to cut their commitment, tuition rates go up and, I must say, just on case in point, for individuals that have a fixed rate that we have now, that I must say, senior members of the Republican Party are joining in with the banks to come up with this variable rate scheme that is put on by the banks, I must add, that borrowers default 8 percent of the time when they are able to consolidate their loans and 24 percent of the time with when they fail to consolidate their loans.

So when you look at it, the 24 percent, guess who wins? Well, the American people lose because they back the loans. But the banks win because, guess what? They are able to do that \$500 fee all over again.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman can, before we run out of time, which I think we have about 10 minutes left, the gentleman from Ohio has to talk about this scheme that books are high-

er here in the United States than they are overseas. But before that, I am sorry, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) was in the middle of something.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would love to hear about the books, because I could tell my colleagues, I happen to be able to help my daughter, but I know what the cost of the books are, because I have to pay for them and I have to go into that billfold that the gentleman from Florida went into. Sometimes mine is empty, but it is empty because I have to pay for those books. I want to hear about the cost of books.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would like to see the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) pull his wallet out again.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, my son's birthday was yesterday and I pulled the wallet out. I have been married 12½ years and someone asked me for a 20 and I said, I have not seen one in 12 years. So I ended up opening my wallet and somehow gifts and things, and I am here and I am waiting for the end of the month.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, one issue before we get into the books, I want to talk about the GI Bill. I do not know how many stories, if this is anecdotal or what, but I have heard a lot over my lifetime about people who are in the greatest generation and they are telling the story of their life and they say, well, and then I went to medical school, or well, and then I went to become a lawyer. And I would always ask, well, why? And they said, well, I did not know what I was going to do and the GI Bill was going to pay for it, so I went.

Now, how many kids are out there right now who, if we gave them that opportunity, they would say, I do not know what to do, I have a bachelor's degree in political science, I know I cannot make a very good living off that. What are you going to do? I am going to go to law school, I am going to go to medical school, I am going to go to do something that is important.

But I think one issue that we do want to touch on before we leave here is to talk a little bit about textbooks. And nothing, nothing in my educational career got me more hot under the collar than when I had to return a textbook that I paid, or my mother or my grandparents paid \$120 for, and you bring it back at the end of the semester, and they will give you 5 bucks, 10 bucks back for it.

So we have a piece of legislation here, just to shout out to all of the college students, we did not forget you. We know this is a major issue, we know this is a major problem.

There are textbooks that are sold in the United States that are sold for half the price in England. So the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU), a Member of Congress here, has a bill that we are kind of jumping on that is going to ask

the General Accounting Office to investigate these high prices of college textbooks and the disparity of prices between textbooks sold in the United States and overseas. There is no way a textbook sold in the United States, written in the United States, published in the United States, copyrighted in the United States should be \$100, and they are sold at a bookstore in England or in London for \$50. There is no reason why that should happen. So we want to do an investigation. We want to see why that is.

We are also on the brink, and I think we dropped it last week, of having a piece of legislation that would give parents or students a \$1,000 tax credit for the price of college books. That should cover a good portion of the books that people spend in a year.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that the gentleman should say tax credit, very interesting, because this country, as we talked about earlier, about helping the rich, but showing the direction that we could move in.

I want my colleagues to listen to this. JOHN KERRY has what he calls a "college opportunity tax credit." What this simply says, it will make 4 years of college affordable for all Americans. We are talking about all Americans here. He will provide a credit for each and every year of college on the first \$4,000 paid in tuition, and that is the typical tuition cost and fees at our public institutions and universities. Senator KERRY's tax credit will be refundable to our most economically-vulnerable students and for those who receive other credits. That is the direction that we should be moving in.

That is why the gentlewoman from California (Leader PELOSI) was here leading the 30-Something hour. That is why I think that we have the gentleman from Ohio here and the gentleman from Florida here and the gentlewoman from California who was here and others that are involved, that is the direction of continuing the greatness of America by investing in our young to make sure that their tomorrow is brighter than our today.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Well, I can tell my colleagues right now, this whole issue of taxes, who pays them and who does not pay taxes is the defining issue here. I think it is very important that the American people understand that I am so glad that we are here tonight talking about solutions. We have a bigger job, identifying and describing the problem, that is good, because we are the Congress, we are an investigative body, we are hopefully a body of action and correction. But I will tell my colleagues this: if we stand idly by and allow individuals to come in, rob future blood lines of families, Democrats, Republicans, Independents, you name it, like David Letterman said, if you live in Sioux City, Iowa, you should be able to receive a higher education, your grandchildren and your children.

I will say once again, there is no greater prayer or hope that your chil-

dren do better than what you have done, and the grandparents' philosophy is that their grandchildren have a better opportunity than what they had. And right now the way we are going, that is not happening.

Now, we talk about how we are going to do certain things, we talk about promises, and I am so glad that the gentleman from New York mentioned what Mr. KERRY is talking about.

□ 2130

Mr. Bush, I can go forever talking about things that President Bush has said he was going to do that he has not; but tonight is not that night.

It is what he said that he would do for students, what he would do for working families, and he said that he would make good on his promise in the 2000 election, that he would raise the maximum Pell grant award to \$5,100 for college freshmen. That is just for college freshmen.

The gentleman mentioned Senator KERRY wants to give a \$4,000 tax credit every year. That is just not, we want to get you in school, but we are not necessarily concerned about you finishing school. Because, guess what, you got to take out that loan to make sure our friends at the banks are happy. That is what keeps this thing rolling.

Instead of producing young minds, making them bright, making our country strong, we have a number of visas where we are shipping in people constantly to do the work that Americans could do if they were trained and if they had an opportunity to get that education.

I am glad the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) mentioned his lawn cutting. I used to be a State Trooper in Florida. The gentleman was in Ohio so I did not pass him out on the highway while he was cutting grass. So I am glad the American people know that we are not from Mars. We are from the ranks of working people.

I want to mention one other thing that is very, very important, that Americans that are able to receive good jobs, they are able to support our economy, also provide health care for their families, if they do not receive a college experience, fewer and fewer students are going to school today, are being denied education, more and more students are being denied education because of what? Cost and also the availability of classes and community college systems and the 4-year institutions because they are having to cut.

Some of the chancellors, God bless them, they say we cannot go up on tuition any more, but what do they do then? They cancel classes or courses.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Maybe one of these weeks we could talk about No Child Left Behind. And I do not want to get into a K through 12 debate now, but it is the same issue. In Ohio, for example, the State legislature did a study, No Child Left Behind underfunded by \$1.4 billion. So now that means that the State, in order to fulfill

their obligations to the Federal mandate, must come up with more money. Does that mean they will take more from the college subsidies for higher education that the State puts on? Does that mean more of an increase to the property tax of someone who is paying property tax in the State of Ohio? Where will we get this money?

I guess the thing I want to communicate is that this is doable. The beautiful thing about this democracy is that it belongs to us. And if young people want to participate in this system and in an election from Republican to Democrat, then they can do it. There are enough students out there to make this happen.

If you want the millionaires' tax cuts to go away or not necessarily even go away, just a portion of it going away to pay for this, that is doable. If you get active and you get involved, let us know, 30somethingdems@mail.house.gov.

Let us know what your ideas are. We need young people to participate in this process and replenish this system because it has become very stagnant down here. It has become a very small group of people who raise money, dump it into this institution, get the legislation they want. That legislation helps them make more money and they take their profits and it is a cycle that goes on and on. And the only thing that combats that is democracy and young people getting involved in the process.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Just what we are talking about, showing that you have a plan and moving away, Senator KERRY talked about his College Opportunity Tax Credit, but he also understands the deficits that the universities are having. So he also has a plan. It is called the State Tax Relief and Education Fund where Senator KERRY will help States struggling to bridge deficits resulting from the Bush economic policies with \$25 billion to stop educational cuts and tuition increases across the country.

So it seems to me we are moving in the right direction. He also is talking about service for college so that if, in fact, he will initiate an offer to Americans to earn the chance of the equivalent of the State's 4-year public college tuition in exchange for 2 years of service. Senator KERRY will set a goal within the next decade of enlisting 500,000 young people a year in service for college. Steps in the right direction. Educating our young people, making it affordable for them and strengthening our country. This is what America is all about.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. If you are a young student sitting at home right now, watching this or hearing about these policies, what would you rather have? That is that democracy. It is that simple. What would you rather have, tax cuts? A millionaire getting \$130,000 back or a program like this where you will get a credit for your textbooks; you will get "I Have a Dream Scholarships" for your community service;

help the States to make sure that they do not cut back; tax credits; increase in the Pell grants. What do you want?

If you are a student and you want certain things, then you have to get out and participate in the system.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. As we close here tonight, I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) and also the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ) for their assistance and help here today.

We ask American people to continue to tune in and communicate with us. I want to commend the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for putting this together. We thank the Speaker for the opportunity to address the House and the American people tonight.

#### CHANGING MEDICARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the body for allowing me to come and address them tonight.

America is absolutely a magnificent place. I was one of six children growing up on a small five acre farm just south of Hobbs, New Mexico. My father worked in the oil industry as a roustabout. We were not poor but we definitely did not have as much as many families have. And to have the six children graduate from high school and go on to college, and for each one of us to become successful in our own ways, to be blessed with the opportunity to serve in this House of Representatives, is truly one of the great blessings that this country offers.

My wife and I were able, about 14 years ago, to make a down payment on a business. And in this country we were able to pay that business off and able to build that business from four employees to 15 employees because of the tremendous opportunities that this country has.

One of the things that became obvious to many people in the last several years is that with all of the opportunities and with all of the hope that is there were still things that needed to be done.

Last year, as many as 75 percent of Americans said that we needed to pass a prescription drug bill. Mr. Speaker, when I got here to Congress, I began to look at the Medicare program. And one of the things that struck me was that both Democrat and Republican analysts, the economists, both forecast tremendous difficulties in the financial part of Medicare within the next 4 to 10 years, depending on which economists you talked with.

So it became obvious to me that we had two significant problems. We had a need for a prescription drug plan because America's seniors were having to

choose between food and medicine, and we had a Medicare program that faced insolvency, some say earlier than the 2017 projected by the trustees of the Medicare program. At any rate, whichever figure that you use, the tremendous financial difficulties faced by the budget created by the Medicare problems needed facing.

As a business owner, I was not about to sit by idly and let that train wreck come toward me. We began to address the problem. So these were the two things that we put into a bill. The prescription drug bill and we began to reform Medicare in order to have Medicare available to the next generations and to the generations beyond that.

Now, we wanted to craft a bill that was entirely voluntary. That was very important. Many of our seniors wanted a choice. They said we want a choice but do not mandate the choice. Make the choice voluntary. So that was one of the elements that we put into this bill, that it was entirely voluntary. Seniors can choose to participate or they can choose to stay exactly as they have been.

Now, in my own marriage we are a couple that would probably split our choices because I do not like change. I am like the seniors that do not want change, but my wife every day reads all she can about medical literature. She reads all she can about the different medicines that are available. Myself, I just want to know what ones I am supposed to take and I will keep taking it. So I think that in our marriage that my wife and I represent the two different choices that seniors told us that they would like to have in, and this bill allows both camps to have it the way they would like to.

Now the reform process that we have put into place was significant. For the first time under Medicare, we are able to give physicals, people entering into the Medicare program will have physicals. And if there are problems that are noted, then Medicare can pay for those problems to begin curing because another reform that we have put in is that for the first time we are allowing disease management instead of waiting until the problem becomes catastrophic, which was the old method under Medicare. We are now proactive in dealing with the illnesses out front in allowing the physicals, but then also allowing disease management.

Now, under this program, another reform that we put into place is that we now allow screenings for cancer. We allow screenings for diabetes. We all know that if you screen and detect early, that the cost of cure and the cost of remedy is less than if you wait until the catastrophic point. Not only is the cost less, Mr. Speaker, also the survivability is much greater. So there are many reasons that we felt reform was desperately needed in this plan and we have addressed those one by one and put deep reforms into this plan so that Medicare could begin to lower its costs currently while offering better care,

greater survivability, and offering financial stability into the next generation and the generations beyond.

Now, I mentioned that we wanted competition in this bill and we got competition. Seniors are going to be allowed to choose private parties if they would like that, but they are allowed to stay in Medicare as they know it if that is what they want.

Now, there has been much hubbub, Mr. Speaker, many of our friends on the other side of the aisle declare that this bill is full of corporate welfare. Now, what they are trying to cover up is that we have made some very good decisions. Many of the seniors in this country have retiree benefits. My father is an example. He retired from Exxon and has medical benefits through that retirement plan. Almost always when seniors tell me that they want us to not mess with their retirement benefits, they are hoping that their company will continue retirement benefits into the future.

What we did in this bill, Mr. Speaker, that is described as corporate welfare, is we gave an incentive to those companies who have retiree benefits. We are willing to pay almost a quarter or maybe a little bit more if the companies will keep those plans in place.

Now, we will tell you, Mr. Speaker, that before we put in plan into place in the bill, 40 percent of the Nation's companies that offer retiree benefits were scheduled to drop them or delete them. After we passed the bill, that 40 percent dropped to 16 percent.

Now, keep in mind that if the retirement benefit has dropped, is dropped by companies, that the Federal Government will pick up 100 percent of the costs as those people transition from retiree benefits over into Medicare.

To the Republicans in the House, it made sense that we would do what we could to encourage companies to hold those retirement benefits because our seniors liked them, but also they are cheaper for the Federal Government. So it can be described as corporate welfare if you would like, but the greater and deeper understanding is that we wanted to create an incentive which would allow companies just the possibility of extending retirement benefits.

One of the most dramatic things we did under the bill, Mr. Speaker, is we put a health savings account in. Health savings accounts are a fairly simple process. It is a medical IRA. You can put money in tax free at any age. You build up interest on it tax free. You can take the money out tax free at any age if you use it for medical purposes. And then you can pass it on to the next generation if you do not use it, and the next generation has a head start on the cost of their medical care.

Mr. Speaker, the health savings account can, by itself, revolutionize the way we buy and spend our health dollars in this country today. The health savings account can be used for medical purposes which are described very broadly in this bill. It can be used to



pay for premiums. You can buy your insurance through your health savings account.

□ 2145

You use it to pay for deductibles. You can use it to pay for office visits, emergency room or prescription drug costs.

Mr. Speaker, I would tell you that my company that my wife and I had built, if we still had that company, I will tell you that we would give the bonuses that each year we gave to our employees, instead of writing the check to the employee, we would have put it into their health savings accounts. Typically, we would have put \$2,500 or \$3,000 into our employees' accounts each year. Then it probably also would have lowered their take-home pay, and we would put that money over into the health savings account so that we reach the maximum of \$5,000 per year per account.

After we had put 5 to 10 or \$15,000 into the account, we would then start shopping for insurance which instead of having a \$500 deductible, it would have had a \$2,500 deductible or \$3,000 deductible. It is at that point that the insurance costs begin to collapse, usually to about one-quarter of what they are. So that \$3,000 deductible, maybe the insurance rates might fall from \$500 per month down to \$100 or \$150 a month.

As we compress the cost of health insurance, Mr. Speaker, more of our young couples will opt back into buying health insurance; and the young people in the system, those who use it the least, make our health insurance system more stable.

Again, another thing that, of course, we did in this plan is we built the prescription drug benefit into it. Basically, we wanted to make sure that the people of low incomes were treated as well as we could, and then people of higher incomes would receive a different treatment. We simply split that up in order to allow the government to pay for it. If we had given the same prescription drug benefit to all people, as our friends on the other side of the aisle have suggested, the cost would have been driven from about \$400 billion to \$1 trillion. We felt like that for the future generation's sake that we must watch the cost on this bill as much as possible.

So for our seniors, at 150 percent the rate of poverty and less, that is about \$18,000 for a married couple, we have no gap in coverage. They are covered at 75/25. That is, government pays 75 percent; the participant pays 25 percent. And that is up to about \$5,200, at which point we said we think that is catastrophic coverage and we will begin to cover it at 95 percent of everything above that upper threshold, the cap of the program.

The cap is available to all income levels because we did not think anyone should risk losing their house and home. If you have more than \$18,000, if you are more than 150 percent the rate

of poverty, then we have a different program. Up to \$2,200, you again have the 75/25 split, the government picking up 75 percent, the participant 25 percent; but then there is the gap in coverage that has been so demonized by our friends on the other side of the aisle. We put the gap in simply to allow the bill to be paid on this, the Medicare bill to be paid by the government.

My mom is an example of someone who falls into the gap. So I called her before we voted the first time on this, Mr. Speaker, because I, like other Members, still go home for Thanksgiving dinner and need to talk to my mom when I get there. I felt it best to address the issue up front. So we called her and asked. Her response to me was, Son, we have been blessed more than most people. We are not rich, we are not wealthy, but we have a pension that comes in from Exxon. We think that if we can pay more we should pay more.

It helped me to make up my mind on this bill, to vote for that famous gap that people are talking about, which simply is an effort to make this bill affordable to this generation and the next generation, but the prescription drug benefit again is voluntary. You have the ability to opt in or the ability to opt out of it, but it is available for all.

Now then, that program starts in 2006, Mr. Speaker; and so we wanted to do something for our seniors that are currently facing the desperate need to pay for their prescription drugs. We have this year and next year a \$600 card for those people at 150 percent the rate of poverty or less. Those people get the \$600 card, which is just like a credit card and can be used to pay for their prescriptions. We felt that the people on the lowest end of the income spectrum needed attention immediately, and we did give that.

Also, one of the reforms that we built into this Medicare bill was income as it relates to Medicare. It is a very high income relating but still not only in the prescription drug bill; but in the Medicare portion of it, we felt like it was needed to begin to control costs so that Medicare is available to the next generation and the generation beyond.

There were some leveling mechanisms that we also put into this bill. Mr. Speaker, I campaigned, talking about the need to reimburse all States equally. Before this bill, an urban State received higher reimbursement than a rural State for the same procedure. If a person went into a hospital in New Mexico and had a procedure done, Medicare would reimburse at a lesser rate than if they went into the hospital in New York City. I campaigned saying that we needed to level those two amounts, the reimbursement amounts, and we did that 100 percent for the hospitals. The hospitals in rural areas now receive the same reimbursement for procedures that hospitals in urban areas previously did.

I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, that another important thing in this bill for

New Mexico was the fact that we addressed the border question. By immigration law, when a person comes to the border, immigration law says that the nearest hospital will take that person and cure any medical deficiencies that they have. If the Federal Government is going to mandate that, and my district is on the border, then the Federal Government needs to help pay the bill, because I have hospitals in my district that have been greatly penalized by this requirement that should face all of us if it is a Federal law but instead was being faced just by the border hospitals. There is \$1 billion in this bill, Mr. Speaker, that helps to defray the cost during the next 4 years that border hospitals have faced dealing with this immigration question.

Mr. Speaker, we also recognize that disproportionate share hospitals, the DSH hospitals, should receive greater reimbursement in this because they deal with a greater percentage of Medicare patients. If that is the case, then DSH hospitals, the disproportionate share hospitals, are receiving also a little more help under this bill.

Mr. Speaker, we have done dramatic work in this bill. I will tell you that the enrollment process for the prescription drug card began just yesterday. First of all, let me share, Mr. Speaker, with the House the enrollment process. You can get enrollment information from your local pharmacy or on the Web site, [www.medicare.gov](http://www.medicare.gov). That is [www.medicare.gov](http://www.medicare.gov), or you can call a toll free number of 1-800-MEDICARE, and you should receive packets in the mail from your local drug card sponsors. You can log on to the [www.medicare.gov](http://www.medicare.gov) or call the 1-800-MEDICARE number to find out if you qualify for a prescription drug card and which card will benefit you the most.

To enroll in a Medicare-approved discount card program, beneficiaries must first select the discount drug card that best meets their needs. They then will submit basic information about the drug coverage status to select a drug discount card program. You will turn in your ZIP code, the drugs that you are currently taking, and how far you are willing to drive to your pharmacy, and then you are told how much that it is going to cost you.

Mr. Speaker, I received information just yesterday about the first person who was able to sign up for one of these cards. This person was 85 years old. She lives in New Mexico. She gets a \$400-a-month Social Security check. Her prescription cost is \$409 per month. Mr. Speaker, she is the target that we had in mind when we built this bill: people of low incomes, modest means, who are paying almost everything out for medicines that they take in.

She called the 1-800-MEDICARE to find out if she would benefit from a prescription drug card. She told them which medications she used, how much she paid for them, which pharmacy she wanted to go to, how much her Social Security check was, and what current

benefits she had. They used all of her information to determine which prescription drug card would benefit her.

Mr. Speaker, I myself felt like we had passed a good bill; but when I got the information from this lady in our State in New Mexico, I knew that we had done a good job.

Mr. Speaker, we have not yet gotten into the heart of the competition; yet this woman in New Mexico, a retiree, 85 years old, \$409 a month in medications, with her card, her cost is going to be \$13.61. Mr. Speaker, this is the value of competition. It is this competition that the Republicans in this House wanted to unleash and to get active in people's lives, allowing competition, not the government, to drive down the prices that we find our seniors paying.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you that there was great debate. People wanted the Federal Government to negotiate for prices. Much was made of the fact that we did not have the government negotiating prices. Three of the letters that are most hated in the alphabet by our seniors are HMOs. When I go to town hall meetings, I hear the anger at HMOs because the HMOs have someone sitting in a room somewhere that is not a physician, who is telling them what medical procedures they can have and what prescriptions they can have.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you that in the debate of whether or not the Federal Government should be buying medications and redistributing them, I felt like the competitive model was going to be the most powerful, and when I see that the competitive model that we have unleashed in this bill drives the cost from \$409 a month to \$13.61 per month, I know that we have chosen correctly. I do not think that the government could buy and distribute medicines that well. If we think the government can do it, then we think that the postal service is going to work efficiently tomorrow. I myself do not feel that way.

Mr. Speaker, I am joined tonight by good friends and colleagues of mine. We have got the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE). I would welcome them to the discussion and would ask that the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE) take the floor, make any comments that she would have, and then allow her to turn the floor to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY), who is a physician; and I would like to continue this discussion of the Medicare bill and the things that they are finding in their districts.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Mexico for yielding.

Coming from Florida, we obviously have a large number of seniors; and particularly in my district, we do not have wealthy seniors. The interim prescription drug card that is available, that began to become available yesterday, is a great benefit for so many of my constituents.

A lot of times there is a great fear of the unknown, and I think it is exactly what happened. I think that some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle in the Democrat Party had so frightened seniors that these cards were not going to be sufficient and that sufficient savings were not going to take place.

I have heard very positive comments from seniors in my district that the Web site is easy to navigate on. I actually, like you, also called Medicare because I wanted to make sure that there was not a big backlog or a long waiting period before you got a real person on the line, and that absolutely is not the fact. It is a very efficient system. There are operators standing by, and that number again is 1-800-MEDICARE, and you simply tell them your ZIP code and the number of prescriptions that you are taking now, and they will help you to navigate through which card is best for you.

I think it is important that Americans realize that, first of all, this is a voluntary prescription drug plan. It is not mandatory.

□ 2200

When one looks at the prescription drug cards, certainly it is not a one-size-fits-all scenario, nor should it be. Many people in my district have Tricare for life and/or they have retirement benefits from when they were employed, and they are happy with those. We want them to keep them. That is very important. I know that I worked with the two gentlemen here this evening, one from Georgia and the other from New Mexico, to make sure that we encouraged employers to continue to offer those benefits. How do we encourage them, with a tax-free subsidy.

I believe that the number of employers who will stop health care coverage to retirees, that the number of those that will stop will severely dwindle. I recently had a constituent come to me, and I am originally from New York. He had worked for a major power company there. He was so afraid that they were going to drop their coverage. Well, I called the power company for him as I told him I would do, and asked them exactly what their plans were, and explained the 28-cent subsidy tax free that they will receive. They have looked at the tax-free subsidy, they have no intention of dropping their coverage, and the constituent is very happy to know that the company that he had spent well over 35 years working for is going to continue the retiree coverage. As we worked on this bill, I know to many of us that was a very important factor.

I also visited the Web site, and here are a few examples of what I found on the Web site. For example, Lipitor, a common drug used to curb high cholesterol, according to the Medicare Web site, 17 Medicare discount cards are available to constituents living in, for example, Brooksville in my district,

who take Lipitor. Most of the cards are accepted at over 8 different pharmacies within a 10-mile radius. Today, for example, seniors living in Dade City, Florida, are paying up to \$87 for a 30-day supply of Lipitor. However, beginning in June, some of the cards will offer a 30-day supply for as low as \$67. Many of the cards have no enrollment fee. That is a savings of \$20 a month.

Another very common drug is Zyrtec, which is taken for allergies. Seniors in Crystal River are paying \$86. According to the Medicare.gov line, one prescription discount card will only charge \$58 a month for Zyrtec with no enrollment fee, and that means a \$28 a month savings. There are many other examples of some of the other prescription drugs that also have savings, and I added some of them up. For example, Zyrtec, Lipitor, and Prevacid, which is used for acid reflux disease, the Prevacid, they actually will save \$50 a month on by using the prescription drug cards. When we add all of this up, that is a savings of \$350 a year, and that is if they are not low income. It is \$350 this year, and \$700 in 2005, and that is just for one prescription. If a senior took all three of these, they would save almost \$600 this year. When you combine 2004 with 2005, it would be \$1,100.

That is why I absolutely cannot understand why our colleagues on the other side of the aisle who are supposed to be so concerned about the poor in our Nation have absolutely no concept of the benefits that this prescription drug bill will bring to every constituent.

As I went around in my district when we were off during April, I had many town hall meetings, and there were some things I said to people who said I do not need the plan. I have a great plan or I am on Tricare, I am covered for life, I am fine, no thank you. I said to them, well, for your friends and neighbors or maybe later in life you decide this is a good plan for you, but there are some great benefits in there for those on Medicare. For example, they will have a Welcome to Medicare physical exam that never before has been available.

There was scheduled by a previous Congress, not one that any of the three of us belonged to, but there was scheduled to be a Medicare home health copay. That copay for home health care, which is so necessary when someone comes out of a hospital setting, and they are coming out of hospitals a whole lot sooner now, and they go to the home, and having home health care is such a blessing because it helps them to be in their home where they will recuperate better and also have medical supervision. There was a copay scheduled to be to go into effect. The copay scheduled has been scrapped by the Medicare Modernization Act.

Additionally, there was a \$1,500 physical therapy, occupational therapy and speech therapy cap, a total of \$1,500 a year for all the therapies. If you broke your wrist, \$1,500 worth of therapy

might be okay; but Lord, if you have a stroke, you need all three of those therapies. You need physical, occupational and speech therapy, and \$1,500 was just the tip of the iceberg for the needs of those who had had a stroke. We eliminated that very arbitrary and cruel \$1,500 therapy cap which another session of Congress had imposed.

Additionally, doctor reimbursement. Physician reimbursement was scheduled to be cut by 4.5 percent. I was hearing, as were many of my colleagues in Congress, hearing that doctors were going to withdraw from Medicare because they had an unusual phenomenon of their Medicare reimbursement was going down and their expenses were going up, certainly including malpractice insurance. Those two storms, if you will, of rising costs and lower reimbursement were a problem on the horizon that this bill took care of. We did not cut physician reimbursement, we actually increased it by 1.5 percent so physicians are staying in the Medicare program.

With so many seniors in Florida, it is so important that we have adequate physicians, and it is funny the gentleman should mention the HMOs. In my area, so many of my constituents love HMOs. I actually was at an event last night in Lake County, and she said to me, What are you going to do to get some HMOs here? They had lived in another county that had a lot of HMOs, and she really appreciated HMOs and wanted to know when we were going to have an HMO in Lake County. I explained that is not something that the government mandates, but here is an example of somebody who is very happy with an HMO, and I have heard that from many of my constituents.

But for those who live in counties where HMOs are, this bill also increased the reimbursement to HMOs and mandated that they either increase the benefits to those subscribers who are in HMOs or that they cut the costs. In my area, in the Tampa Bay area, we have a variety. Some added services, and others cut the monthly subscription fee. So many people are very glad that the HMOs are being adequately reimbursed in this bill for those who love the HMO concept.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) bringing this timely discussion before Congress. As the gentleman has so carefully pointed out, it was yesterday, the very first day that seniors would have an opportunity to go, as the gentleman mentioned, on the Web site or pick up the telephone and just dial 1-800-Medicare, and find out which prescription drug discount cards are offered in their area. You just put in the ZIP Code. For me it is 30064 in Cobb County, Georgia. You find out which cards are offered in your area, and where is the closest drugstore which accepts one of these prescription

discount drug cards. We had a great turnout. We probably had 60 seniors at the senior center in my district, the 11th Congressional District of Georgia. I think they were very pleased. There were some great questions.

And certainly this bill, if you look at the whole of it, and my colleagues have explained it very well tonight, yes, it can be a little bit confusing and that certainly is true. A lot of people, as mentioned, do not like change, and it is going to take a little while to get used to this, but help is there. The Secretary of HHS has hired an additional 1,400 people on the Medicare system just to man these call centers. Yes, those jobs are new jobs created in this country, they are not outsourced jobs. These people are sitting in front of a computer, and seniors who are not so comfortable sitting in front of a computer, all they have to do is respond to the questions, and they will get a list of the cards and they will put in the medications they are on, maybe it is 3 or 5, and the dose, and how many times a day they take those medications, and they will be able to compare.

If there are three cards available in their area, they will know how much discount they get on each one of those prescriptions. Obviously, they will want to choose the card that gives them the best deal.

I want to commend the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE) because when we first were discussing this bill, how about these pharmaceutical companies that offer discount cards, and usually they give these discounts and incentive programs to those people that the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) was talking about, those that are on a fixed income, living at or near the Federal poverty level, so the pharmaceutical companies have helped in that regard. Typically, though, they only offer discounts on the drugs that they sell.

What I tell my seniors, as they look for the Medicare discount card, and maybe it covers 2 out of the 3 medications that they are on that gives a good discount, but on the third, if it does not, it may be that they have a discount card from that pharmaceutical company that makes that drug, and so they can use their cards in combination. Much credit for that goes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE) because she made sure that these companies submitted letters. As we were debating passage of the Medicare bill with the prescription drug benefit part D, she ensured that these companies pledge not to drop these programs, and I certainly commend her for that.

Mr. Speaker, one thing more I want to say about this bill. You have heard the expression that a group can accomplish great things, a team can accomplish an unlimited number of things if nobody cares who gets the credit. Now that is true, but I am, unfortunately, learning more and more in politics all too often it is really about who gets

the credit. Politicians care too much, especially in a Presidential election year. Some of the opposition we are getting from the other side of the aisle as we debated that bill, and even now, it reminds me of the 2000 Presidential election.

I would say to them, do not go back to that sore-loser mentality. Get over it. Republicans and this President passed a bill that you guys were never able to pass. You made a promise, but you did not deliver on it, and now you are mad because this President did deliver on his promise, and this Republican-led Congress have finally given the seniors something that they have desperately needed.

□ 2215

But I would say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, join with us, take some of the credit. Indeed, a number of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle voted to support the bill. But to continue to scare seniors, to talk about this new Medicare Modernization and Prescription Drug Act that my two colleagues have so carefully outlined the benefits of, to say that that is a fraud on the seniors and it is just an election-year ploy or a sellout to the pharmaceutical industry, this is unconscionable, to scare these seniors. And when we talk to them in our districts, of course, we have to spend maybe the first 15 minutes of the hour trying to overcome some of that negative, inaccurate Medicare rhetoric.

I would say to my colleagues, it is time. Embrace this bill. It is a wonderful thing. It is not perfect. Few bills are. I do not think I have ever seen any that did not need at some point some tweaking. But it is a great step in the right direction; and as the gentleman from New Mexico has so clearly stated, it gives the best benefit for the seniors who need it the most. In fact, it is an absolute godsend for seniors who have to choose between medication and food and utilities and a roof over their head. That is the safety net.

Yes, we wish we could do more; but as has already been stated, instead of costing, whether you estimated this at \$400 billion or \$520 billion, what the Democrats wanted to do on the other side of the aisle would have cost \$1.75 trillion. Of course, we would like to be able to afford to do these things, but at a time when we are trying to win the war in Iraq and equip and protect our troops and shore up our Department of Homeland Security, there is just not enough money to do that.

I would say to my colleagues, get on board, join with us, take some of the credit and you will deserve it.

Mr. PEARCE. I thank the gentleman for his comments and the gentlewoman for her comments. They both pointed out many things that we really should be discussing. I have seen the Medicare tactics that are used in my State. In fact, State officials are going around and trying to convince senior

groups that in fact this is not a good plan, but they are sledding against heavy opposition because the seniors themselves have been reading the bill. The seniors have looked at the endorsements of this bill. I think the endorsements were a very key part of not only passing the bill but feeling comfortable with passing it.

We are endorsed, of course, by the AARP. Almost all of the hospital associations endorsed this. The physician associations endorsed this. The prescription manufacturers endorsed it. One group after another and maybe either the gentlewoman from Florida or the gentleman from Georgia can tell me exactly, but I think there were over 130 endorsements of groups that cater to seniors and watch out for seniors, saying at the end of the day, this bill is a good bill. So it was with some comfort that I voted for it.

There are questions that come up about this bill when we are talking, people get concerned about the reimportation and why we cannot reimport drugs from other countries and why we did not put the reimportation of drugs into this bill. Mr. Speaker, I would remind this body that about 2 weeks ago we saw on the evening news, in China, a firm that was distributing counterfeit formula for infants, and we began to see hundreds of infants dying and hundreds of infants sick because there was a counterfeit drug used. I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, the last question that you have to ask is if we allow the wholesale reimportation of drugs, are we going to have those same counterfeit problems on our shelves here as China saw? At the crux of the problem is the security that we face when we purchase anything from our drug stores on the shelves of our stores. Mr. Speaker, that is one of the most important concepts that seniors ask about and there was a very good answer and a very sad answer given on that evening news report.

The one piece of legislation that as we look at our medical facilities, as we look at our medical costs, as we look at the ability of physicians and hospitals to provide care, the one thing that we need to have passed, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure the gentleman from Georgia will concur, is we need medical liability reform. The personal injury lawyers are driving up the costs of medicine, but they are driving providers out of business. We have been told, Mr. Speaker, in my district in one town we may not have an OB-GYN left in the town and it is a town of about 75,000, that there will not be an OB-GYN left in that town by the end of the year because of the threat of lawsuit. Mr. Speaker, one of the desperate problems that we must cure is the lawsuit abuse that is occurring in this country. No one person would watch while there was no remedy in our courts. What is going on right now is not a remedy. It is considered a lottery. The trial lawyers feel like they have a lottery, and they have access to everyone who pro-

vides medical coverage in this country, and it is literally driving the costs up too high to continue to practice.

I yield to the gentleman if he would like to discuss this.

Mr. GINGREY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. Of course, that is a peripheral issue; but certainly it is an issue of great concern. I thank my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, on both sides of the aisle in the House when over a year ago, in fact, H.R. 5, the HEALTH Act of 2003, was passed in this Chamber. What I will always stress, Mr. Speaker, is that the medical liability reform issue, tort reform, if you will, is really all about balancing the playing field, leveling the playing field. I think that is our responsibility as Members of this Congress, to always try to have a balanced playing field and not to give one side a tremendous, unfair advantage to the detriment of the majority. I think that is what is happening now in our legal justice system, particularly in regard to the practice of medicine.

Again, I do not, Mr. Speaker, try to paint with a broad brush every good attorney in this country and some of whom, yes, practice personal injury law and represent their clients well, but there are so many frivolous lawsuits; and as the gentleman from New Mexico says, it is causing us huge problems of access. The bottom line is not so much the physician's bottom line, but it is the patient's bottom line. Of course, when a doctor stops his practice, Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman mentioned so many are doing in his district in New Mexico, it is not just a loss of a physician. It is also maybe a loss of 15 or 25 jobs in his or her office. It is a huge issue.

I appreciate the fact that the gentleman mentioned it in the context of talking about health care, talking about the Medicare Modernization and Prescription Drug Act. It is all interrelated. This President and this Congress can understand that, this Republican leadership, Mr. Speaker. That is why we wanted to get these things accomplished. We are unfortunately continuing to wait on the other body. But we did get this Medicare bill passed, in fact, by a large majority of the other body.

As I was saying earlier, it is time for our colleagues to get on board. Take some of the credit for some good that you have done even though we had to drag you kicking and screaming. I do appreciate the gentleman bringing it up.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that the cost of litigation drives up health care costs by 25 to 30 percent. It not only drives up physicians' costs and hospital costs but also pharmaceutical company costs because so many times there are extremely expensive lawsuits that are out there. Whether the lawsuit goes completely to court or whether it is settled out of court, all of this drives up the cost of health care. A lot of times, constituents will say to me,

well, that medicine was actually patented 5 years ago. Why are they continuing to increase the price? It is a lot of times because of litigation that is ongoing that drags on for absolutely years.

When I was a State senator in Florida, I accomplished some tort reform in the area of nursing homes because we had nursing homes leaving the State. Accomplishing tort reform is a very difficult job. There is a very delicate balance there. You want to make sure that those who are harmed by an egregious act, that there is a method for compensation for them. But the number of frivolous lawsuits has gotten so out of hand. My constituents will come to me and say, isn't there some sort of law against filing frivolous lawsuits? In Florida we actually have a law. Does the gentleman know how many times judges have imposed fines on attorneys for filing frivolous lawsuits? There was one judge. It was an amount of money that he fined the lawyer that he could take it out of his wallet and hand it to the judge that day. Obviously, there is not enough of a financial disincentive there to thwart the number of lawsuits that are filed. Again, this drives up the cost of prescription drugs.

But getting back to the prescription drug bill, passage of this bill is one way that we can help so many low-income seniors. My mother-in-law was only on Social Security. The pharmacist came to us, gave me a call and said, you know, she's not refilling her prescriptions often enough. My husband and I took over and assisted with helping her with her prescription drug costs. But there are so many families out there who cannot or will not for some reason help their elderly parents or grandparents. The passage of this bill gives seniors dignity because they do not have to turn to their children. I think that is an important concept that we may have not promoted enough and that certainly the other side is missing. For somebody who only has Social Security, you cannot afford car payments and insurance payments and your rent and food and buy those prescription drugs. Believe me, my mother-in-law is not atypical. There are so many seniors who are in exactly that situation, older teachers who outlived their pension, just a lot of seniors who only have Social Security or very, very small pension amounts. They will fall into this category of a single person with \$12,568 or a couple of \$16,861. There are so many people who will benefit from this.

I say shame on the Democrats in this House for not promoting this bill in their districts, for again engaging in the Medicare tactics of the past.

Mr. GINGREY. Just on that thought, the other side of the aisle always takes a lot of credit for being the party of women's rights. Yet they are certainly overlooking a tremendous women's right in regard to this particular bill, and I think the gentlewoman from Florida was just alluding to that.

Women live 4 or 5 years longer, maybe 85 years compared to us male counterparts, about 81 years. Many of them who work get into the workforce a little bit late in life, maybe they are choosing to raise a family, to be a mom, to be a grandmom; and they never quite catch up in their income level, even though in some instances they are doing the same work. And so more of them, a disproportionate share of women are the ones who are living and many times single at or near that Federal poverty level. They have got, Mr. Speaker, a great deal of health care needs, of course, and a lot of prescriptions, whether it is something for osteoporosis or high blood pressure, cholesterol or maybe even chemotherapy to control cancer. They are in desperate need.

So I say to my colleagues across the aisle, if you want to truly be the party of women's rights, then you certainly ought to support this bill.

Mr. PEARCE. I thank the gentleman for his comments and the gentlewoman for her comments. Women are the great beneficiaries, and a tremendous number of the people who will participate in this prescription drug program under Medicare will be women because many of them fall in the lower income strata and many will qualify for the 100 percent coverage throughout the spectrum, but they have been made afraid that they are going to be the ones falling into the gap.

□ 2230

The only people who fall under the gap are those who can afford it. Those with the most desperate needs get coverage all the way up and down the spectrum, Mr. Speaker. So that is an important distinction to make.

One of the things that we have not yet talked about that the prescription drug bill did, it did three things to kind of give the prescription drug makers a wake-up call. None of us would choke the prescription drug manufacturers down to nothing because they are making magnificent miracle-like drugs that are extending life and extending the quality of life. But we did three things in this bill to really get the attention of the prescription drug manufacturers just a little wake-up call, if the Members would.

First of all, we cause generics to come to the market sooner in this bill. Secondly, we give incentives for people who will use the generics to convert useage over from the more expensive prescriptions into the generic field. But the third thing that we did was to stop an abusive pattern of constantly extending patents which kept competitive prescription drugs from coming to market. A prescription drug maker gets a patent when they reinvest in a new drug. When they do the research and development and create a new pharmaceutical, they have a patent period, and what they are doing is just indefinitely extending the patent. They would go to a second patent period, a

third, a fourth, a fifth, and a sixth by minor changes in their patent application. It was legal, but it was not right.

So what we begin in this bill is saying that they get one patent period, they get one extension, and no more. The effect of that is it is going to bring those competing products to the market sooner. So we did three things in this bill, Mr. Speaker, to really address the seniors' frustration with their prescription drug makers to let them know that we appreciate what they do, they do good work, they are good companies, they are good corporate citizens, but to please look at their practices just a little bit.

Access and affordability are the two parameters of care. It does not matter if one has affordability if they do not have access. This bill attempted to cure access as well as affordability. And, Mr. Speaker, I think that we have done well in our job.

I thank the gentleman from Georgia and the gentlewoman from Florida for coming out tonight. This is a very important topic, and since yesterday was the initiation point of the ability to sign up for the drug cards, those discount cards, we felt like it was important to remind the people of this House exactly what that means and what the bill means. We wanted to have a review of the process which was directed at again the two basic overarching problems. One is the need for a prescription drug benefit in this country because our seniors were having to choose between food and medicine.

The second need we were addressing is the financial difficulty that Medicare faces in a very near-term future, extending on into the very distant future. This Medicare bill and this prescription drug bill began the process of reforming the Medicare program to where its financial viability is greater to where the next generation and the generation beyond that has access to the Medicare bill. But we also put in a prescription drug benefit that has the potential to dramatically lower the prescription drug cost that our seniors will face.

Mr. Speaker, I for one am proud of the work that we have done. And as I have visited with seniors around my district, and we have had 10 or 12 town hall meetings in my district about the prescription drug bill, I find that seniors are energized and excited about what we have done here in our legislation. They are excited about what it does currently for seniors, but they are also excited about the reforms that we have made to where their children and grandchildren will hopefully have access to the Medicare plan which they have grown to love and to trust.

Mr. Speaker, I share with the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE) the pride in what this body has done.

## IRAQI DETAINEES AT ABU GHRAIB PRISON

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to decide where to start in expressing one's outrage about the revelations, including the graphic photographs, that our military personnel literally tortured Iraqi detainees at a prison near Baghdad. It is even harder to know where the responsibility ends for conduct that obviously violates the Geneva Convention on care for prisoners of war and Geneva Convention on the obligations of an occupation authority.

For any decent-minded American, whether he or she supports the war or opposes the war, to remain silent about this conduct is to be complicit with this conduct. To refuse to condemn it in the strongest terms possible, to be reluctant to hold accountable not only those who did this but also those who permitted it, those who ordered it, those who created an atmosphere that encouraged it, and those who sent the signals that everything and anything goes, no matter how far up the chain of command, it jeopardizes our relationship with the entire Arab and Muslim world. We should all fear for every American soldier and civilian in Iraq whose life has been placed in jeopardy by this irresponsible behavior and, frankly, the irresponsible conduct of this war.

Before these revelations, it was manifestly clear that our Iraq policy was in deep, deep trouble. It was already clear that we faced a widening and deepening resistance. It was already clear that the administration's characterizations of the resistance as "dead-enders," "remnants of Saddam's regime," and "terrorists from the outside" did not coincide with reality. These allegations, revealed first last week by 60 Minutes II, then detailed by investigator reporter Seymour Hersh of the New Yorker Magazine, and substantiated in a courageous report by Major General Antonio M. Taguba, may have made our situation irrevocably untenable.

Think of the predicament now facing U.S. occupation this way: What would anyone anywhere in the world want to do to someone who had done such despicable acts to a family member?

The President and other senior administration and Pentagon officials have been quick to say that only a few participated in these deeds. My question is who are the few? Over the weekend, the mistreatment was said to involve only six or seven military police. Now at mid week, we are told that 17 U.S. soldiers are under investigation for their role in the abuses, including seven supervising officers who will receive an official reprimand or admonishment, six enlisted personnel who are charged with criminal offenses in

March, and another four who are under criminal investigation.

Against this backdrop, General Richard Myers, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said this past Sunday that he had not read the Taguba report. It has taken until today for Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld to make a statement, and according to a Pentagon spokesman, as late as today, Mr. Rumsfeld had not read the report either.

National Security Adviser Condoleezza Rice is the coordinator of our overall efforts in Iraq. She has been silent as well. Secretary of State Colin Powell says that the entire military should not be condemned for the actions of only a few.

No one is condemning the entire military, but once again I ask who are the few? Does it include those, whoever they are, who told the military police to "soften up" the detainees for interrogation? I cannot accept, especially when we hear that military intelligence and private contractors ordered the actions, that these military police officers just happened to choose acts that are offensive in any culture, but are especially humiliating to males in the Arab and Islamic cultures.

And logic leads me to believe the psychological implications were well understood, and the acts imposed on the detainees were deliberately selected.

It is fair to ask what else may be going on? Has there been such a heavy reliance on private military contractors precisely to evade criminal liability? Have not Iraqis been given new reason to view the United States war on terrorism as a war on terrorism against them, their religion, and their culture?

Congress needs to conduct a probe of the incidents and their wider ramifications. Congress and the American people must answer to questions that we can be sure that the people of Iraq and all Muslim lands are asking. While the full weight of punishment should be brought on all of those implicated, the American people, as a whole, need to appreciate how much higher the mountain now is that the President must climb to win the hearts and minds of the Iraqi people and to persuade the Middle East to follow the model of American democracy. Under his leadership things continue to go from bad to worse to terrible.

#### IRAQ WATCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE) is recognized for half the time remaining before midnight, approximately 40 minutes.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I come before the House this evening in this special order representing those of us who have participated in what we have termed "Iraq Watch."

For some period of time now, several of us have come before this House to

try to analyze in a hopefully dispassionate way but in an informative way what is taking place in Iraq and what the implications are for us here in the House of Representatives, and by extension for the Nation in terms of the political ramifications.

I come here tonight by myself because the other members of Iraq Watch, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOFFEL), the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND), the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE), and others who have joined us periodically are otherwise occupied this evening. But I come here representing those who have participated because of the seriousness of the issues that are now confronting us with respect to Iraq.

I have before me, Mr. Speaker, a copy of the May 3, 2004, issue of the New Yorker Magazine entitled "Torture at Abu Ghraib." I cite this, Mr. Speaker, because I am afraid we are going to hear this phrase on more than one occasion in the days to come. It is written by Seymour Hersh, subtitled "American Soldiers Brutalized Iraqis, How Far Up Does the Responsibility Go?" I am citing this to the Members this evening, Mr. Speaker, because this is the only comprehensive report that I, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, and as a Member of the House, have been able to get. I was intrigued by it because it mentions two reports. The speaker before me, the gentleman from New York, mentioned a report written by Major General Antonio Taguba, who happens to be by coincidence from Hawaii, but he did not mention nor have many other venues that I have observed, television, radio, newspapers, articles, et cetera, another report. The report from General Taguba being completed in February of this year, but that followed on a report that was written and submitted in November of last year, November of 2003, by the Provost Marshal of the Army, the chief law enforcement of the Army, General Provost Marshal Donald Ryder.

□ 2245

I think that I can begin to account for the tone, at least the summary of the tone as far as it has been delivered to us, which is one of outrage. I withdraw that. That is my characterization.

But let me put it this way: I believe it is fair to say if Mr. Hersh's summary is correct, that General Taguba's report was, at a minimum very, very intense, and that Mr. Hersh stated as follows: Its conclusions about institutional failures in the Army prison system were devastating. I think that is a fair summary.

The reason I am citing this to you, Mr. Speaker, is that at a meeting this afternoon, at a briefing this afternoon, convened under the direction of the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), chairman of the Committee

on Armed Services, under his auspices, officers appeared. Given the nature of the hearing, the secret nature of the hearing, again, for good and sufficient reason, I cannot cite to you and will not cite to you the exact dialogue that took place, nor those who were involved in it.

But, suffice to say, it was confirmed to me in that hearing, I should say in that briefing, that there was indeed a report given to General Sanchez, the Supreme Commander in Iraq, in November of last year, and that General Ryder, according to Mr. Hersh, indicated in November, and this is important. The reason we are going through this now and the reason I am going through this recitation is these incidents did not just happen. They did not just appear out of nowhere.

This is not something that the Army was aware of only in February of this year, that there was some kind of shock recognition by the Army that this was taking place in February. Because General Ryder clearly warned, quoting now from the Hersh article, "that there were potential human rights training and manpower issues system-wide that needed immediate attention."

It also discussed serious concerns about the tension between the missions of the military police assigned to guard the prisoners and intelligence teams who wanted to interrogate them.

Again, I will go on, another quotation: "Army regulations limit intelligence activities by MPs to passive collection."

I think this is an important point, because I see some of these National Guard people who have been identified and who have had their pictures on television and are being pointed out and being looked to for responsibility. I think it is important for those who may not be familiar with the situation in prisons, Army prisons, military prisons, that Army regulations limit intelligence activities of MPs to passive collection.

Something obviously went awry here. There was evidence, according to the Ryder report, evidence going back as far as the war in Afghanistan. Now we are going back even previous to 2003. We are talking about post-9/11 and the attack on the Taliban forces in Afghanistan.

According to the Ryder report, as reported by Mr. Hersh, the MPs had worked with intelligence operatives to "set favorable conditions for subsequent interviews," a euphemism, according to Mr. Hersh, for breaking the will of prisoners.

Now, Mr. Hersh indicates that the Ryder report called for the establishment of procedures to "define the role of military police soldiers, clearly separating the actions of the guards from those of the military intelligence personnel."

I am citing this detail to you, Mr. Speaker, because I think it is very important to establish a context here.

General Ryder is the Provost Marshal of the Army. He is the chief law enforcement officer of the Army, and he in his report indicated serious questions with regard to the management and operation of the prison system, and indicated serious reservations about the kinds of expectations of the MPs with regard to military intelligence activity.

Major General Taguba in his report, and, again, I am relying on the Hersh document because, to the best of my knowledge, these reports were not made available even to the intelligence committees, let alone to the Committee on Armed Services, either in the other body or in the House of Representatives.

General Taguba was reported as saying, "Unfortunately, many of the systemic problems that surfaced during Major General Ryder's assessment are the very same issues that are the subject of this investigation."

It amounts to an indictment, Mr. Speaker. I do not know any other way to put it. That is why I say I feel so badly coming down here today. Believe me, this brings no sense of satisfaction to me, to have to report this to you.

If the Army was aware at the highest levels of the difficulties and challenges that existed, let alone the possibility of abuses or even undermining of good order within the Army in terms of what is expected of its personnel in the prison system, and was aware of that in the fall of 2003, it can hardly have come as a surprise then if General Taguba was exercised by what he found taking place in February of 2004.

If indeed General Taguba's report is as detailed and as explicit and its recommendations as clear as it appears to be in the summary given to us in Mr. Hersh's article, how is it possible for the Secretary of Defense, who, after all, is in charge of the uniform military, and the Speaker is well aware of our constitutional circumstances here. The civilian authority is in charge with regard to what the policies of the United States military are going to be. How is it possible for the requisite authority in the Department of Defense not to be aware of what these issues were?

It is very difficult for me to believe that General Sanchez kept this to himself, or that General Sanchez failed to act on the clear warning that General Ryder, his chief law enforcement officer, expressed to him in writing in November of last year. It is difficult for me to believe that there was not some awareness in the Department of Defense that there were possibilities here for disaster, political and military disaster.

Mr. Speaker, it is fair, I suppose, for someone to ask, well, yes, of course we can see why you might be upset as a Member of Congress that you were not informed. And I am, I can assure you of that. In fact, I will cite to you, Mr. Speaker, in a few moments a letter received by the ranking member of the

committee, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), from the Secretary of Defense, that at best misleads, deliberately misleads the ranking member in questions that he had about private contractors, and at worst is a deliberate subterfuge and challenge to this Congress. Not to Democrats or Republicans. I am talking about a challenge to Congressional authority.

I tell you, Mr. Speaker, we are walking on the edge of fascism in this country if the executive or executive departments think that they are able to make decisions absent the direction and will of the Congress of the United States. For good or for ill, Mr. Speaker, you and I are elected by the people of this country. Secretary Rumsfeld is not elected by anybody. He is an appointment and serves only because he has been approved by the Congress of the United States, in this instance the will of the other body as embodied in their charge in the Constitution.

For good or for ill, the people of this country have put their faith and trust in us to make those decisions. We have clear jurisdictional lines in the Committee on Armed Services. We have clear admonition under the Constitution as to what our duty is and our obligation is under that Constitution with respect to funding and managing the United States military.

For any executive, or anyone in the executive branch, to assume that he or she can take legislative authority unto themselves, particularly when it comes to oversight, is something that is anathema to the constitutional order. Executive authority, ruling by executive authority, has a fascist tinge to it that I find very, very troubling. I do not think it can be excused by the idea that we would be better off without knowing.

I do not know if this is true, Mr. Speaker. I have only the media representations to me, seen in fleeting images and heard in passing tonight. But if I understood correctly and if the information is correct, the President of the United States found out about this from the media. The President of the United States was not informed that these issues were already underway and about to break in the public press.

We are told, at least I am informed, again by media presentation, because we have not had any briefing or explanation of this in the Committee on Armed Services to my knowledge or to the Congress as a whole, that General Myers, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in fact asked a broadcast network, I believe the CBS network, not to publish or broadcast news of these events that it had before it and was prepared to bring forward.

This is a startling development in our country, that this kind of censorship can take place, because we are not talking here about putting members of the United States military in harm's way because of the revelation of immediate plans of attack or the assumption

of military planning that would otherwise bring aid and comfort or information to forces that might attack us or do us harm. This was not an instance of that.

On the contrary, if what has been presented so far is true and is an accurate reflection of what took place, these are clear violations of regulations in the good order in the United States military and a severe blow to the activities of the United States with respect to the reconstruction of the physical facilities in Iraq and the establishment of civil government in the wake of the collapse of the Hussein regime.

It strikes me that when the ranking member makes a request, as he did on April 2, and the ranking Member, as you know, is the senior minority member, in this instance the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON). He serves as the senior Democratic member on the Committee on Armed Services under the leadership of the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

On April 2 Mr. SKELTON wrote a letter to Mr. Rumsfeld, the Secretary of Defense. I would like to quote it to you in some length.

"Dear Mr. Secretary. I would like to first extend my sympathy and display over the recent brutal killings in Fallujah. All of the killings in Iraq, both of our troops and of contractors and civilians, have been unacceptable and tragic, but the murder and desecration of the four Americans working for Blackwater USA was particularly barbaric. I would hope that plans are being prepared for a measured but powerful response. One of the issues raised by this tragedy is the role played by private military firms such as Blackwater.

□ 2300

"Media reports indicate at the time of the ambush the personnel in question were providing security for a food delivery convoy. I understand that Blackwater provides personal security for Ambassador Paul Bremer. I would like to request that you provide my office with a breakdown of information regarding private military and security personnel in Iraq."

That bears repeating, Mr. Speaker: "I would like to request you provide my office with a breakdown of information regarding private military and security personnel in Iraq. Specifically, I would like to know which firms are operating in Iraq, how many personnel each firm has there, what specific functions they are performing, how much they are being paid, and from which appropriations account. Additionally, I would like to understand what the chain of command is for these personnel, what rules of engagement govern them, and how disciplinary or criminal accusations are handled, if any such claims are levied against them."

This is in April, early April. These questions, these measured, sober, serious questions regarding the privatization of this war are being asked by the



senior minority member of this House of the Committee on Armed Services.

"Firms like Blackwater are clearly serving important functions in Iraq and putting themselves at risk. It is important that the Congress have a clear sense of the roles they are playing so that we can conduct effective oversight. I appreciate your assistance in this matter. Sincerely, IKE SKELTON, Ranking Democrat."

I think by any measure, Mr. Speaker, this would be seen as a letter that, as I have already indicated, is sober and serious and measured in its content and specifically and particularly on the mark with respect to the role and responsibility of private contractors.

Why am I bringing that up? Because it appears, Mr. Speaker, that there are serious instances of perhaps a blurring of institutional and responsibility lines, with private contracting, military intelligence, and the conduct of the prison guards and those in charge of the Army prisons.

Why I am particularly exercised even more than I was this afternoon? Because I thought this afternoon, well, we have to try and determine where we are going to go, and I put out a release to that effect in order to answer to my constituents as to what the thoughts were on this issue at this time. I thought, well, we better be careful about making grand pronouncements about what we need to do and where we are going to go until we find out all of the facts and see where they lead. But I will tell my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, I have come to the conclusion that the Secretary of Defense has to think very seriously about resigning. I have come to that conclusion only since this afternoon, late this afternoon, early this evening, rather, when I became aware of the answer to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) dated May 4, the date that I received this, May 4 is printed on here; whether it was written May 4 or whether it was received in the office of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) on May 4 is difficult for me to determine. It may be that that is a stamp to indicate to my office that it was received in my office on May 4.

But here is the answer given by Donald Rumsfeld, the Secretary of Defense: "Thank you for your letter of April 2 regarding private security personnel. A discussion paper provided by the Coalition Provisional Authority responding to the points that you raised is attached," and it is.

Now, here is the answer given by the Secretary of Defense with regard to private companies, knowing, knowing now, this is April, knowing about the report of November 5, knowing about the 30-plus or 35 investigations under way, according to reports that we have received in the press, which I think reflect accurately some of the conversation that was held this afternoon. Multiple, let me put it this way, multiple investigations under way. Knowing that, knowing that he had the report of

General Taguba before him, knowing that this material had been deliberately asked to be censored and withheld from publication in the network news.

Here is what he says: "Some private security companies called PSC, private security companies, under contract in Iraq provide, one, personal security services for senior civilian officials, as well as some visiting delegations. Two, they also provide physical security for nonmilitary facilities inside the green zone and convoy protection for nonmilitary goods. Three, they provide protection for government support teams consisting of Coalition Provisional Authority personnel and government contractors who team with local Iraqi officials to develop local government structures and functions."

Not a word, Mr. Speaker, about the role of private contractors and military intelligence or in the prison system. How is it possible for the Secretary of Defense not to mention this, given the context in which this answer was given to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON)? That is why I am so exercised about the contempt that the Secretary is showing for the Congress and yes, indeed, for the President of the United States. How is it possible for the Secretary of Defense to face Mr. Bush, let alone this Congress, and say that he deliberately, I cannot think of any way else to characterize it, deliberately kept us from understanding what it was that these private contractors were doing in this prison context.

He goes on to say: "It is my understanding that most of these private security companies doing business in Iraq do not work directly for the U.S. Government." Well, who are they working for then? They work under subcontracts to prime contractors to provide protection for their employees, as if there is some benign presence. We are in the middle of a war on terror, we are told. We are in the middle of a war in Iraq. The Speaker is well aware that I characterized this more than a year ago in May when we returned, when we were among the first group to go with the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), some of us went with him, among the first group to enter Baghdad after the initial attack on Baghdad and some of us said, yes, there was an attack on Baghdad and now the war is starting.

Unfortunately, that has proven to be only too true, for the Secretary of Defense to pretend in the middle of a war situation in which our troops are put at risk, that somehow, there is this semi-benign presence in Iraq, of private contractors to go about their business without the supervision or the oversight of the Department of Defense and the United States military. I mean, it is an insult.

"A draft CPA order, Coalition Provisional Authority order, on regulating the private security companies which will require certain data from each firm has been prepared with input from the Iraqi Ministry of the Interior."

I mean, the contempt of this letter is incredible.

"The Iraqi Ministry of the Interior and Ministry of Trade will be largely responsible for the administration of this and any revisions that may be promulgated by the Iraqi interim government after June 30. Finally, the Department of Defense is drafting uniform guidance regarding private security companies employed in Iraq under contract using U.S. appropriations."

It is as if it does not even exist at this point.

"I hope this is useful. We can provide additional information or briefing if you would like."

Then we have a summary here in the attachment which includes a list, Mr. Speaker, of the private security companies operating in Iraq.

Now, I believe that there was a company called CACI. I do not precisely have that because I do not have the report here; I am looking for it in this list of private security companies operating in Iraq. Perhaps it is listed here, but I cannot find it among the 60, the 60 companies that are listed here. It may be that I am not sufficiently conversant with the actual names and acronyms of the security companies that were working intelligence privately in Iraq. I would be more familiar with it had we been briefed on it, had we been given the information, as is not only our right, but our obligation to have in the Committee on Armed Services.

□ 2310

I cannot find it. It is very, very difficult for me to believe that we are in a situation, post-Watergate in which it is necessary to know the answer ahead of time in order to ask the right question. It seems to me the questions posed by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) are clear enough. It seems to me that the answer here, while probably technically correct, leaves out valuable information. This is clearly not an exhaustive list of the private companies that were involved.

I concentrate on this, Mr. Speaker, because I think we face a serious crisis here in the Congress. If we are going to allow the executive to conduct this war in our name, the name of the people of the United States, and we constitutionally have not only the authority, but the responsibilities of legislating the policies associated with arming and supporting our military, our United States military as well as establishing the policies of this Nation to be carried out by the executive. The executive does not tell us what to do. We again, for better or for ill, are given and required by the Constitution to exercise that legislative authority.

The legislation we have put together, the policies that we have assume by virtue of a majority activity in both Houses of this Congress, are what constitutes the policies of this country that will be carried out by the executive. The executive can inform of his or

her desires in this regard, but we are the ones that have to decide this. We are the ones that have to exercise the oversight.

So I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that these are very, very serious allegations. No question about that. I do not come here this evening speaking with any kind of relish or enjoyment of what is required of us here. But I can tell you I was a probation officer in my life. I have been an officer of the court. I have had professional responsibilities in county jails, in San Quentin Prison. I know what it is like to have to conduct drug tests. I know what it is like to appear at a booking desk every morning year in and year out. I know what is involved in investigations in arrests and prosecutions.

I know what is involved in making reports on what needs to be done and how it should be done and what the conducts of officers of the courts are with respect to the management and maintenance of jails and prison systems.

I have legislative responsibilities with regard to how prison systems are run and under what circumstances and what is required of the personnel as a legislator. I have been the chairman of a committee with responsibility for the police departments in Honolulu, the Honolulu Police Department, under the jurisdiction of the committee that I was privileged to serve on and chair in the city and counties of Honolulu. I understand what is at stake in prison system, and I know this from my own personal experience, what is required in a prison system is, first of all, certainty, certainty.

You must know from the top to the bottom exactly what the rules are. Certainty and activity. Those are the two fundamentals. Once you have those established in a prison system, then you know where you stand. Nobody can talk to me about failure to train some National Guard operatives on the jail cell level and tell me that they were operating on their own. That does not happen, Mr. Speaker. It does not happen in the county jail. It does not happen in a state prison. And it does not happen in a Federal prison system. Certainty from top to bottom is required. If it does not exist that is failure of leadership that has to be accounted for and responsibility has to be taken.

So far as I can see right now, there is some reprimands being handed out. There are some court-martials being held at the lowest possible level. And yet we have two reports, the Ryder report and the Taguba report, that I do not believe for a moment did not see the light of day at the general officer level and at the highest levels of the Department of Defense.

If it is true that the President of the United States was not informed by his Secretary of Defense as to what the situation was and what was likely to happen, that is dereliction of duty on the part of the Secretary vis-a-vis the President of the United States. It is far

worse in my estimation that you let down the person who has entrusted you, entrusted you with the responsibility for carrying out the executive policies of this Nation.

It is bad enough that the Congress of the United States was not informed. But they have the President of the United States left in the dark on something that was sure to have incredible negative ramifications with respect to Iraq and the position of the United States is unforgivable. It is intolerable. But I know as sure as my own experience indicates, that it is not possible for the leadership at the levels that I have discussed not to have been aware that at minimum the possibilities of this disaster was there and needed to be addressed. At a minimum. And worse, that they knew it was going on and tolerated it.

We need to have a full exposure of exactly who knows what. Not because, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to have some kind of a media field day or some kind of a tabloid extravaganza, but because the very responsibility of this Congress is at stake. Either we are informed, Mr. Speaker, about what the situation is and where we are going so that we can make a decision with regard to oversight or we are not.

So, Mr. Speaker, in conclusions, I want to ask you in your role as Speaker, to acknowledge the facts that this is a requirement of the Congress of the United States, that we exercise oversight on behalf of the people of this Nation and the values of this Nation. If we do not do it, Mr. Speaker, who is going to do it?

It is apparent that no one wants to take responsibility in the Department of Defense. No one wants to take responsibility in the military at the present time. No one is exploring right now exactly what the boundaries were or were not. No one is examining the role of private security corporations in the intelligence gathering on behalf of the United States military and on behalf of the security interests of this Nation. No one asked me about it, I can assure you on the Committee on Armed Services as to whether I thought that was a good idea. I cannot speak about the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, but I am hard pressed to think that the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Republican or Democrat, this has nothing to do with the partisan nature of any kind of political discussion we might be having, but it is difficult for me to believe that anybody on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence sanctioned such a thing or that there was knowledge of it in the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence or that it would not have been shared with the Office of the Speaker at a minimum with the leadership of both sides of the aisle.

We have to have an understanding of whether our role as overseers of the United States strategic interests is going to be honored. If we do, then per-

haps we can reestablish some credibility. If we do not, then I fear that the role that Secretary Rumsfeld has assumed for himself, namely, chief operating officer of the United States, without any responsibility to the chief executive of this Nation, the President of the United States, or any responsibility to the Congress of the United States. He gets to decide what we will do and what we will not do. He gets to decide whether or not this country is going to be put into a series of circumstances and situations that are totally untenable in terms of the values of this Nation or what the goals and aspirations we have with regards to our security interests and the peace of the world.

I think that we need to have a clear understanding that unless the Secretary can answer these questions he has to consider resigning. He has to consider whether or not we are going to have a cleansing of the way in which this war is being conducted, in the manner in which it was being reported to us in the Congress and by extension to the people of the United States.

□ 2320

I appreciate the fact, Mr. Speaker, that these are difficult questions, that I have only been able to present a summary of what is at stake here; and I appreciate your patience and forbearance as I have enunciated it.

I do think very, very clearly, Mr. Speaker, that there this is something that has to be addressed, and I would hope that the leadership of the House, both majority and minority, will settle on the proper venue, which I personally believe to be the Committee on Armed Services, but perhaps a joint committee situation, in which these issues are explored; and I hope that the Secretary of Defense will be able to answer adequately what his responsibility and obligation is.

#### HORSE SLAUGHTERING FOR HUMAN CONSUMPTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) is recognized until midnight, approximately 40 minutes.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the first Saturday in May is a special day in the heart of anyone who considers themselves to be a Kentuckian. It is also a special day in the heart of anyone, whether they live outside of Kentucky or not, whether they are a citizen of some other country of the world, but if that person has a special affinity for a breed of horse called the thoroughbred, the first Saturday in May is a special day because it is on that day that the Kentucky Derby is raced each year.

This past Saturday, the 130th running of the Kentucky Derby was held in Louisville, Kentucky, and a chestnut colt by the name of Smarty Jones

won the race this year. His jockey was Stewart Elliott. His trainer was John Servis. His owners are Pat and Roy Chapman; and as you would expect, winning a race of such importance, they were quite ecstatic. They were happy; they were enthusiastic; they had a large celebration.

I have in my hand a picture of another chestnut colt who won the Kentucky Derby in 1986. This horse was the son of a famous sire called Naginski II. The name of this horse is Ferdinand. The jockey on this horse in 1986 was Willie Shoemaker, and the House of Representatives 6 weeks ago did a resolution in honor of Willie Shoemaker. The trainer of Ferdinand in 1986 was a gentleman named Charlie Wittingham of California. The owners of Ferdinand were Mr. and Mrs. Howard Keck of California; and on that first Saturday in May in 1986, the Keck family and their friends and the trainer and the jockey celebrated with great enthusiasm, in the same way that Smarty Jones and the Chapmans celebrated Smarty Jones winning that race.

When Ferdinand won that race in 1986, the next year, 1987, he went on to win the Breeders' Cup by defeating the 1987 winner of the Kentucky Derby, a horse named Ali Sheba; and in 1987, Ferdinand also was selected Horse of the Year.

When Ferdinand retired from racing, he was the fifth leading money winner in the history of racing, winning over \$3.7 million; and like most horses of his caliber, he was retired for breeding purposes because he had a champion pedigree and he had a champion heart.

On the death of Howard Keck, Ferdinand was syndicated and sold to a Japanese company called J.S. Company, owner of a breeding farm in Japan called Arrow Stud Farm which is located on the northern island of Hokkaido, Japan; and Ferdinand went there in 1994, and he was there for about six breeding seasons.

Initially, he was very popular; but over time, he lost popularity in Japan, and Arrow Stud, either working with or in conjunction with a horse trainer named Watanabe, gained possession of this horse, Ferdinand; and to make a long story short, Ferdinand was slaughtered in a Japanese slaughterhouse. So this was the fifth leading money winner of all time, won the 1986 Kentucky Derby, was 1987 Horse of the Year, won the Breeders' Cup and was slaughtered in Japan.

Interestingly enough, the Keck family of California, before they realized that Ferdinand had been slaughtered in 2002, did everything possible to locate Ferdinand; and they wanted to bring him back to their farm in California for retirement, and finally they found out, it was acknowledged that Ferdinand was slaughtered in Japan.

Other than the Keck family and those who followed the horse industry, this was just another story with a tragic ending. However, it was a story that ended up in the newspapers and peri-

odicals around the world, and from those stories, we suddenly came to realize that in the United States horses are being slaughtered in two locations for human consumption; and the horse meat is being exported to Japan, Italy, France, and Belgium.

There are only two places that this is occurring today. One plant is owned by a French family operating in Kaufman, Texas. The other plant is owned by a Belgian family operated in and around Fort Worth, Texas; and each year they are slaughtering about 45,000 horses in those two plants.

What makes this quite interesting is that the former Attorney General of Texas, who now is in the United States Senate, Mr. JOHN CORNYN, was asked in 2002 for a legal opinion on whether or not the slaughter of horses for human consumption in Texas violated Texas State law. In his opinion, which he rendered in August, Mr. CORNYN, as Attorney General of Texas, issued a ruling that, yes, it is a violation of Texas State law to slaughter a horse, possess a horse, transport a horse for human consumption. He also went on to say it is a criminal offense; and yet, despite this opinion, the two plants in Texas, one owned by a French family, one owned by a Belgian family, filed a lawsuit, and they continued to slaughter horses for human consumption in Texas.

Unlike cattle and pigs and other types of animals, horses in the history of the United States have never been a part of the food chain; and for that reason, Members of the United States Congress, under the leadership, and he has provided tremendous leadership, of the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY), a Republican, and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), a Democrat, both of them introduced legislation to prohibit the slaughter or transport with intent of slaughtering horses for human consumption.

This legislation, as one would expect, has the support of a lot of so-called animal rights groups; but as a Representative of a rural district in Kentucky where we have a lot of livestock, I have never been particularly involved with so-called animal rights groups.

□ 2330

But in addition to animal rights groups, we have a large list of businesses who are supporting this legislation because horses have never been a part of the food chain in America. I want to just read a few of them: Blue Horse Charities; Churchill Downs; Eaton Sales; Fasig-Tipton Company, one of the largest thoroughbred auctioneers in the country; John Gaines, the founder of the Breeders' Cup World Thoroughbred Championship; the Hambletonian Society; the National Thoroughbred Racing Association; the National Steeplechase Association; the New York Racing Association; the Texas Thoroughbred Association opposes slaughter. And I could go on and on and on.

So we have all of these groups that are supporting this legislation to stop the slaughter of horses for human consumption by a French family and a Belgian family to be exported to Europe. And there are only two organizations willing to publicly state that they oppose the legislation to stop the slaughter. One of them is the American Quarter Horse Association headquartered in Amarillo, Texas, although I can tell you we have hundreds of letters from quarter horse owners from around the country who support this legislation; and then the other group, the American Equine Practitioners political arm, has said they oppose this legislation, although we have hundreds of letters from veterinarians from around the country who provide care for horses, say they support this legislation.

Now, one of the sad things about this whole episode of slaughtering horses is that the United States Department of Agriculture has regulations that supposedly regulate the method by which these horses are transported to slaughter. They allow them to be transported in double-decker trailers even though the regulations state that we recognize that many horses will be injured in this process, and they allow stallions to be placed with other stallions which any horseman knows should never be done. Stallions placed with mares, stallions placed with foals, crowded in double-decker trailers.

The Department of Agriculture regulations state we recognize that many of these horses do not have enough head room and so they are bent over. They arrive at the slaughterhouse injured, some dead. They are allowed to be transported up to 28 hours without food, water, or drink; and yet any commercial transporter of horses will tell you that a horse should never be transported for over 7 hours without food, water or exercise, and yet the Federal Department of Agriculture regulations allow 28, up to 30 hours; and even then it frequently is not enforced.

So moving the horses to slaughter is a very inhumane action. And then at the slaughterhouse, the execution is carried out with a captive bolt administered by unprofessionals or non-professionals. The horses' heads are not held, and frequently they have to do three or four jolts before the horse is stunned enough to have his throat slit. It is not a very welcoming site.

And yet because of the method by which this is carried out, the only two entities performing slaughter of horses today are a Belgian company and a French company. In the United States Congress right now without much effort we already have 214 cosponsors of this legislation to stop this practice, primarily because of the efforts of the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), and I might also say that we do have a very strong coalition working together; and Bo Derek, who is an owner of horses,

has become involved in this issue and has made a big difference as well.

I went with the President of the American Equine Practitioners, who is a veterinarian who opposes this legislation, to the United States Senate; and we had a meeting with JOHN ENSIGN, the Senator from Nevada, who is a veterinarian, and he listened to the debate on the issue. When the debate was over, JOHN ENSIGN made a decision that he was going to introduce this legislation on the Senate side, and has done so with a cosponsor, MARY LANDRIEU, the Democrat from Louisiana. They have a number of cosponsors over there.

So this is legislation that is picking up some real support. I want to take this opportunity to inform Members that it is our intention to continue to push this legislation even though we face many obstacles still within certain points within the House of Representatives. But when this is over, we are going to have in the neighborhood of 230, 240, 250, at a minimum, cosponsors of this legislation.

Now, there is a writer named Matthew Scully, who is a former literary agent of the National Review and an occasional speech writer for President Bush; and he recently wrote a book entitled "Dominion." And in his book, Mr. Scully affirms man's dominion over animals, which is certainly true; we have dominion over animals. But he also reminds us of our responsibility to animals. To quote Mr. Scully: "The care of animals brings with it often complicated problems of economics, ecology, and science. But above all, it confronts us with questions of conscience. Many of us seem to have lost all sense of restraint towards animals and understanding of natural boundaries, a respect for them as creatures with needs and wants and a place and a purpose of their own. Too often, to casually, we assume that our interests always come first, and if it is profitable or expedient, that is all we need to know. Sometimes we are called to treat animals with kindness, not because they have rights, not because they have power, not because they have any claim to equality, but in a sense because they do not, because they all stand unequal and powerless before us."

"It is true that the welfare of animals is not high on most people's priority list and kindness to animals is among the humbler duties of human charity, though for just that reason among the more easily neglected, and it is true there will always be enough injustice and human suffering in the world to make the wrong done to animals seem small and even insignificant."

Matthew Scully goes on and says perhaps that is part of the animal's role among us, to awaken humility and compassion.

□ 2340

We have the power, we have the rights, we have the dominion over ani-

mals; and that is precisely why I believe that the gentleman from New York's bill and the gentleman from South Carolina's bill is so important, because it will be the first time that I know of that we have had a debate in the United States Congress on this important issue facing our old friend. At the horse park in Lexington, Kentucky, there is an inscription that says, "Civilization was built on the back of a horse." So we are going to have a debate in this Congress on whether or not a French company and a Belgian company should violate Texas State law to slaughter our horses to export to Belgium, Italy, France, and Japan horse meat for human consumption, particularly when you consider that horses have never been a part of the food chain in our country.

As we approach the midnight hour and these Special Orders come to a close, I want to once again reiterate that a lot of what has happened on this legislation was the result of what happened to the horse Ferdinand in Japan at Arrow Stud Farm. Under the continued leadership of the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and the 214 cosponsors as of today of this legislation and Senators JOHN ENSIGN and MARY LANDRIEU and the other Senators who have introduced this legislation on the Senate side, it is our intent to pursue our goal of making it illegal to slaughter horses in the U.S. for human consumption.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. CARSON of Indiana (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business.

Mr. KANJORSKI (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business.

Ms. SOLIS (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of official business in the district.

Mrs. BONO (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today and the balance of the week on account of illness.

Mr. ROHRBACHER (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of caring for his newborn children.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PASCRELL) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. LEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STRICKLAND, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PASCRELL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONYERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MEEKS of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NADLER, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. OSBORNE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. OSBORNE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and May 5 and 6.

Mr. HENSARLING, for 5 minutes, May 5.

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, for 5 minutes, May 5.

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. PELOSI, for 5 minutes, today.

#### BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Jeff Trandahl, Clerk of the House reports that on April 30, 2004 he presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 4219. To provide an extension of highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a law reauthorizing the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 5, 2004, at 10 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7935. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Eligibility of Suspended Health Care Providers to Receive Payment of Federal Employees Health Benefits Program Funds; Financial Sanctions of Health Care Providers Participating in the Federal Health Benefits Program (RIN: 3206-AJ42) received March 25, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7936. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Prevailing Rate Systems;

Redefinition of the North Dakota and Duluth, MN, Appropriated Fund Wage Areas (RIN: 3206-AJ78) received March 31, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7937. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safe Harbor Agreements and Candidate Conservation Agreements with Assurances; Revisions to the Regulations (RIN: 1018-AI85) received April 29, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7938. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Oil and Gas and Sulphur Operations in the Outer Continental — Relief or Reduction in Royalty Rates — Deep Gas Provisions (RIN: 1010-AD01) received April 27, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7939. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — New Mexico Regulatory Program [NM-043-FOR] received April 9, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7940. A letter from the Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Final Determination of Threatened Status for the Beluga Sturgeon (*Huso huso*) (RIN: 1018-AI11) received April 15, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7941. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic; Trip Limit Reduction [Docket No. 001005281-0369-02; I.D. 031804A] received April 27, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7942. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 031124287-4060-02; I.D. 040804B] received April 21, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7943. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone off Alaska; Reallocation of Pacific Cod in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 031124287-4060-02; I.D. 040504B] received April 22, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7944. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Amendment 16-2 [Docket No. 031125288-4102-02; I.D. 110303A] (RIN: 0648-AR35) received April 22, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7945. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Update on Future of the EP Determination Letter Program [Announcement

2004-32] received April 23, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7946. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Request for Comments on Revenue Procedure for Pre-Approved Plans [Announcement 2004-33] received April 23, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7947. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Split-Interest Trust Distributions to Private Foundations; Distributable Amount [Notice 2004-36] received April 23, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7948. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Distributions to Private Foundations from Trusts or Estates; Net Investment Income [Notice 2004-35] received April 23, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7949. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Partner's Distributive Share: Foreign Tax Expenditures [TD 9121] (RIN: 1545-BD11) received April 23, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7950. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Determination of Issue Price in the Case of Certain Debt Instruments Issued for Property (Rev. Rul. 2004-44) received April 23, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7951. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Guidance under Section 1502; Stock Basis after a Group Structure Change [TD 9122] (RIN: 1545-BC28) received April 27, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7952. A letter from the Regulations Officer, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Title II Cost of Living Increases in Primary Insurance Accounts (RIN: 0960-AF14) received April 22, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LINDER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 619. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4227) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend to 2005 the alternative minimum tax relief available in 2003 and 2004 and to index such relief for inflation (Rept. 108-477). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on International Relations. H.R. 4011. A bill to promote human rights and freedom in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 108-478, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

## TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 4011. Referral to the Committee on the Judiciary extended for a period ending not later than July 6, 2004.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. TURNER of Texas (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. DICKS, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HOYER, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. PALLONE, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 4258. A bill to promote technological advancements that will dramatically reduce the timeframe for the development of new medical countermeasures to treat or prevent disease caused by infectious disease agents or toxins that, through natural processes or intentional introduction, may pose a significant risk to public health now or in the future; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Homeland Security (Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PLATTS (for himself, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. COX, and Mr. TURNER of Texas):

H.R. 4259. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to improve the financial accountability requirements applicable to the Department of Homeland Security, to establish requirements for the Future Years Homeland Security Program of the Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security (Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Ms. LEE):

H.R. 4260. A bill to provide for the reduction of mercury in the environment; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MEERS of New York, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. WYNN, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. LEE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. BALLANCE):

H.R. 4261. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to make grants to States to establish statewide screening programs for children who are 5 to 7 years of age to prevent reading failure; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GUTIERREZ (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FARR, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. FILNER, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. BACA, Mr.

HINOJOSA, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILÁ, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. PAS-TOR, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SERRANO, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

H.R. 4262. A bill to provide for earned adjustment to reward work, reunify families, establish a temporary worker program that protects United States and foreign workers and strengthen national security under the immigration laws of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts (for himself, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. OLVER, Mr. SABO, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. WAXMAN):

H.R. 4263. A bill to clarify the calculation of per-unit costs payable under expiring annual contributions contracts for tenant-based rental assistance that are renewed in fiscal year 2004; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. COBLE, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. WEXLER):

H.R. 4264. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to strengthen prohibitions against animal fighting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin:

H.R. 4265. A bill to provide that when a company makes a charitable donation of equipment, the company is generally not liable for harm later caused by that equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLT:

H.R. 4266. A bill to reduce until December 31, 2006, the duty on potassium sorbate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLT:

H.R. 4267. A bill to reduce until December 31, 2006, the duty on sorbic acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. HOYER, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. WYNN, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H.R. 4268. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to ensure that the District of Columbia and States are provided a safe, lead free supply of drinking water; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. WOLF, Mr. HOYER, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. WYNN, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H.R. 4269. A bill to establish an annual Federal infrastructure support contribution for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 4270. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to modify the provisions relating to citations and penalties; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. HYDE, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. PAYNE):

H.R. 4271. A bill to require the Secretary of State, in consultation with the heads of other appropriate departments and agencies, to conduct an economic impact study on the dual gateway policy of the Government of Ireland before the United States takes any action that could lead to the discontinuation of the policy; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 4272. A bill to amend the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 to modify the terms and scope of a land exchange involving Fort Lewis, Washington, authorized between the Secretary of the Army and the Nisqually Tribe and affecting the interests of the Bonneville Power Administration; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida:

H.R. 4273. A bill to establish formally the United States Military Cancer Institute, to require the Institute to promote the health of members of the Armed Forces and their dependents by enhancing cancer research and treatment, to provide for a study of the epidemiological causes of cancer among various ethnic groups for cancer prevention and early detection efforts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H.J. Res. 96. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States regarding the appointment of individuals to serve as Members of the House of Representatives when, in a national emergency, a significant number of Members are unable to serve due to death, resignation, or incapacity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. BIGGERT, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mrs. BONO, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. MYRICK, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mrs. KELLY, Ms. SOLIS, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. ROY-BAL-ALLARD, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. WATERS, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. PELOSI, and Mrs. LOWEY):

H. Con. Res. 413. Concurrent resolution honoring the contributions of the women, symbolized by "Rosie the Riveter", who served on the homefront during World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. HASTERT, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. HYDE, Mr. COBLE, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. WATT, Mr. JENKINS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. KELLER, Ms. WATERS, Ms. HART, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. PENCE, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. FORBES, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. WEINER, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. FARR, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. WATSON, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. WOLF, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. GOODE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. MORAN of Kansas,

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. LEE, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. STARK, Ms. MAJETTE, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DEMINT, and Mr. MOORE):

H. Con. Res. 414. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that, as Congress recognizes the 50th anniversary of the Brown v. Board of Education decision, all Americans are encouraged to observe this anniversary with a commitment to continuing and building on the legacy of Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H. Res. 618. A resolution recognizing the importance of The Call of the Wild on the occasion of the 101st anniversary of the publication of the novel by Jack London; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. COX:

H. Res. 620. A resolution commemorating the 50th anniversary of the landmark United States Supreme Court decision in the case of Brown v. Board of Education; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. STRICKLAND, and Mr. SWEENEY):

H. Res. 621. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Correctional Officers and Employees Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEFLEY (for himself, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. STUPAK):

H. Res. 622. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Peace Officers Memorial Day; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H. Res. 623. A resolution regarding the potential incapacity of Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H. Res. 624. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Transparency Day, which promotes the financial transparency of charitable organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

319. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, relative to H.P. 1458 Joint Resolution memorializing the President and Congress of the United States to not cut the budget for emergency responders; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. CARTER introduced a bill (H.R. 4274) for the relief of Rona Ramon, Asaf Ramon, Tal Ramon, Yiftach Ramon, and Noah Ramon; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 25: Mr. STEARNS.

H.R. 58: Mr. BALLANCE.

H.R. 97: Mr. JOHN, Mr. BURNS, and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 111: Mr. CHANDLER.

H.R. 206: Mr. FILNER.  
H.R. 290: Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. COOPER.  
H.R. 296: Ms. BALDWIN.  
H.R. 300: Mr. REHBERG.  
H.R. 303: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.  
H.R. 572: Mr. FROST.  
H.R. 579: Mr. DEMINT.  
H.R. 677: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. MEEK of Florida, and Mrs. TAUSCHER.  
H.R. 685: Ms. LEE.  
H.R. 713: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.  
H.R. 745: Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. ORTIZ, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.  
H.R. 775: Mr. MANZULLO.  
H.R. 857: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. KELLER, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. EHLERS, and Ms. HARRIS.  
H.R. 887: Mr. LIPINSKI.  
H.R. 1057: Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. WEINER, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, and Mr. COLE.  
H.R. 1105: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama.  
H.R. 1117: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and Mr. ROYCE.  
H.R. 1155: Mr. SIMMONS.  
H.R. 1160: Mr. THORNBERRY.  
H.R. 1205: Mr. WYNN, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, and Mr. BECERRA.  
H.R. 1281: Mr. OSBORNE.  
H.R. 1322: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.  
H.R. 1345: Mr. JEFFERSON and Mr. CHANDLER.  
H.R. 1422: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia and Mr. BOUCHER.  
H.R. 1472: Mr. EVANS.  
H.R. 1700: Mr. FILNER and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.  
H.R. 1731: Mr. GALLEGLY.  
H.R. 1735: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. MARKEY.  
H.R. 1793: Mr. SULLIVAN and Mrs. MUSGRAVE.  
H.R. 1795: Mr. GOODE.  
H.R. 1873: Mr. FILNER and Mr. BAIRD.  
H.R. 1919: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire.  
H.R. 2037: Mr. SERRANO.  
H.R. 2068: Mr. KILDEE, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BOUCHER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. MATSUI.  
H.R. 2069: Mrs. CAPPS and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.  
H.R. 2107: Mr. CHANDLER and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.  
H.R. 2118: Ms. NORTON.  
H.R. 2157: Mr. RODRIGUEZ and Mr. ISRAEL.  
H.R. 2193: Mr. CARDOZA.  
H.R. 2206: Ms. WATERS and Mr. CUNNINGHAM.  
H.R. 2239: Mr. BECERRA, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. BALLANCE, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. LAMPSON.  
H.R. 2293: Mrs. MUSGRAVE.  
H.R. 2404: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. NADLER, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. ACKERMAN.  
H.R. 2426: Mr. BECERRA.  
H.R. 2442: Mr. HILL, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. RUSH, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. OLVER and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.  
H.R. 2509: Mr. McHUGH.  
H.R. 2524: Mr. McGOVERN.  
H.R. 2525: Mr. GONZALEZ.  
H.R. 2527: Mr. McGOVERN.  
H.R. 2536: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.  
H.R. 2718: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.  
H.R. 2727: Ms. HARMAN.  
H.R. 2728: Mr. McKEON and Mr. PAUL.  
H.R. 2729: Mr. McKEON.  
H.R. 2730: Mr. McKEON and Mr. PAUL.  
H.R. 2731: Mr. McKEON and Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 2797: Mr. RANGEL.  
H.R. 2890: Mr. CALVERT.  
H.R. 2929: Mr. SHADEGG and Mr. BASS.  
H.R. 3066: Mr. SHERWOOD.  
H.R. 3069: Mr. RENZI and Mr. HERGER.  
H.R. 3090: Mr. OLVER and Mr. CLYBURN.  
H.R. 3109: Mr. BLUNT and Mr. McCOTTER.  
H.R. 3203: Mr. FOSSELLA.  
H.R. 3204: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN and Ms. PELOSI.  
H.R. 3281: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. EHLERS, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.  
H.R. 3283: Mr. PORTMAN.  
H.R. 3309: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Ms. DELAULO.  
H.R. 3324: Mr. OLVER.  
H.R. 3337: Mrs. CAPPS.  
H.R. 3360: Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.  
H.R. 3361: Ms. SOLIS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. MATSUI.  
H.R. 3386: Mr. OBERSTAR.  
H.R. 3422: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.  
H.R. 3424: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.  
H.R. 3474: Mr. JENKINS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. RAMSTAD.  
H.R. 3476: Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. MANZULLO.  
H.R. 3513: Mr. MOORE.  
H.R. 3604: Mr. MCCRERY and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.  
H.R. 3615: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. HOLT, Mr. FALEOMAVEGA, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. TURNER of Texas, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. MOORE, and Ms. MAJETTE.  
H.R. 3684: Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. WYNN.  
H.R. 3729: Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. HART, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. TERRY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. McCOTTER.  
H.R. 3755: Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. FILNER, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. GORDON, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. FOSSELLA.  
H.R. 3780: Ms. MAJETTE.  
H.R. 3801: Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and Mr. CANNON.  
H.R. 3815: Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. LAMPSON, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM.  
H.R. 3834: Mr. HAYWORTH.  
H.R. 3865: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.  
H.R. 3880: Mr. FROST and Mr. POMEROY.  
H.R. 3908: Mr. LATOURETTE.  
H.R. 3916: Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. HOUGHTON, and Ms. PELOSI.  
H.R. 3933: Mr. PITTS.  
H.R. 3936: Mr. SCHIFF.  
H.R. 3951: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.  
H.R. 3960: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. CONYERS.  
H.R. 3965: Ms. LEE.  
H.R. 3980: Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. DEUTSCH, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee.  
H.R. 3988: Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FORD, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.  
H.R. 3991: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.  
H.R. 3996: Mr. FARR and Mr. WEXLER.  
H.R. 4008: Mr. CALVERT.  
H.R. 4011: Mr. COLE, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Ms. BORDALLO.  
H.R. 4023: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.  
H.R. 4026: Mrs. BLACKBURN and Mr. LAHOOD.  
H.R. 4048: Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. DEMINT, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 4051: Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire.  
H.R. 4061: Mr. WELLER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. STARK, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BELL, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. PENCE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. WYNN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mrs. BONO, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SULLIVAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. WAMP, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. BIGGERT, and Mr. ACKERMAN.  
H.R. 4072: Mr. ROTHMAN and Ms. BORDALLO.  
H.R. 4076: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.  
H.R. 4095: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.  
H.R. 4103: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.  
H.R. 4104: Mr. CASE, Mr. MCCARTHY of Missouri, and Mr. FORD.  
H.R. 4147: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD, and Ms. WATSON.  
H.R. 4169: Mr. RENZI, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. WELLER.  
H.R. 4178: Mr. NADLER, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JOHN, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. FORD, Mr. HONDA, Mr. LAMPSON, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. LEE, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. STARK, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. FILNER, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. FROST, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. MOORE, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ROSS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DICKS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. FARR, Ms. NORTON, Mr. REYES, Ms. MAJETTE, Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD, Mr. OWENS, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. WYNN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. DINGELL, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. RUSH.  
H.R. 4180: Mr. STENHOLM.  
H.R. 4182: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California and Mr. DICKS.  
H.R. 4185: Mr. BEREUTER.  
H.R. 4205: Mr. WAMP and Mr. CALVERT.  
H.R. 4207: Mr. NADLER, Mr. STARK, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mrs. MALONEY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. LAMPSON, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. FALEOMAVEGA, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. GREEN of Texas.  
H.R. 4212: Mr. TURNER of Texas.  
H.R. 4217: Mr. RENZI, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. ACEVEDO-VILÁ.  
H.R. 4227: Mr. WICKER, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. McCOTTER, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. CRANE, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. OTTER, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. CANTOR, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. UPTON, Mr. PORTER, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. COLLINS, Ms. HART, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. WAMP, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. GIBBONS, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. KINGSTON, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. WOLF, Mr. TERRY, Mr. WELLER, Mr. BAKER, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BURR, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. CANNON, Mr. PENCE, Mr. OSE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. KLINE, Mr. JONES



of North Carolina, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. COLE, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 4233: Mr. LANGEVIN and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 4235: Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. CARDOZA, and Mr. WEINER.

H.R. 4239: Mr. AKIN.

H.R. 4246: Mr. PEARCE and Mr. HOLT.

H.J. Res. 94: Mr. CALVERT.

H. Con. Res. 98: Mr. BEAUPREZ.

H. Con. Res. 247: Mr. DELAHUNT.

H. Con. Res. 252: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

H. Con. Res. 276: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H. Con. Res. 285: Mr. GINGREY.

H. Con. Res. 298: Mr. ISTOOK and Mr. CRANE.

H. Con. Res. 336: Mr. WU, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. BELL, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. REYES, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H. Con. Res. 371: Mr. PLATTS.

H. Con. Res. 380: Mr. PORTER, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. FOLEY, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H. Con. Res. 384: Ms. WATERS, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. STARK, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. MARKEY.

H. Con. Res. 392: Mr. TIERNEY and Mr. OBERSTAR.

H. Con. Res. 396: Mr. WAXMAN and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H. Con. Res. 398: Mr. CARTER, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. PITTS, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. SMITH

of New Jersey, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. PENCE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. WELLER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. LAMPSON, Mrs. BIGGERT, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. SULLIVAN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. NUNES, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. PORTER, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. TERRY, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. STRICKLAND, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H. Con. Res. 403: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. GOODE, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. STARK, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. MAJETTE, Mr. WELLER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H. Con. Res. 410: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H. Con. Res. 412: Ms. GRANGER.

H. Res. 38: Mr. RANGEL.

H. Res. 402: Mr. MCCOTTER and Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri.

H. Res. 466: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H. Res. 560: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. LEE, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. FROST, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. ROSS, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. ROTHMAN.

H. Res. 568: Mr. TERRY and Mr. BURGESS.

H. Res. 570: Mr. ACEVEDO-VILÁ, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H. Res. 579: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H. Res. 596: Mr. BERMAN.

H. Res. 598: Ms. HARRIS, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. COBLE, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. SANDLIN, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. UPTON, Mr. COLE, Mr. PORTER, Mr. BURNS, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. PICKERING.

H. Res. 600: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. CHOCOLA, and Mr. HOEKSTRA.

H. Res. 601: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H. Res. 604: Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. DAVIS of Florida.

H. Res. 605: Mr. FROST, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. PORTER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. PUTNAM, and Mr. MCCOTTER.

H. Res. 608: Mr. BLUNT, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. DREIER, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. BURR, Mr. CRANE, Mr. CARTER, Mr. OTTER, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. TERRY, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, and Mr. GALLEGLY.

#### DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 898: Mrs. MYRICK.